58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 9:00 having arrived, the House will be in Session. The Chaplain for today will be the the Reverend John Jerving, Associate Pastor, Douglas Avenue United Methodist Church of Springfield. Reverend Jerving is a guest of Representative Michael Curran. And will the guests in the gallery please rise and join us for the invocation? Reverend."
- Reverend Jerving: "Before we pray this morning, I'd like each of us to take a moment of silent prayer for our hostages abroad. Let's pray. Our God, Creator and Sustainer of all mankind, we pray today for safety, asking wisdom on all sides. We pray that You would intervene and peace might be Today, though we are at the state level, we pray for our national leaders and ask that You would be Body winds down its year, This morning as this tensions rise and patience is short, we ask that You be here, that these men would... and women would seek truth and justice using wisdom as their quide. Be with them in a special way, that their work might be accomplished and that their compromises might be agreeable to all. We ask that You would be with them today and through the rest of these In Thy name we pray. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bopp, will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

  States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,

  one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
  for all."
- Speaker Greiman: "Boll Call for Attendance. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 Members having answered to the Call of the Quorum, a quorum is now present. Consent Calendar Second Reading, Second Day."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar Second Reading, Second Day, page
32 of your Calendar. Senate Bill 815, a Bill for an Act in
relation to filing date for returns of certain state taxes,
together with Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill.
That was Senate Bill 513."

Speaker Greiman: "Consent Calendar Third Reading, Second Day." Clark O'Brien: "Consent Calendar Third Reading, Second Day, 36 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Grant Park. Third Reading of Senate Bill 103, a Bill for an Act to amend Act concerning hospital costs. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 527, a Bill for an Act to amend the Good Samaritan Food Donor Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 567, a Bill for an Act to amend the Beef Market Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate a Bill for an Act to amend the Dental Service Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 714. a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to product liability actions and product liability insurance. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 732, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate 803, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 904, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 914, a Bill for an Act in relation to banking. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 982, a Bill for an Act to amend the Critical Problems and Comprehensive Health Education Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1142, a Bill for an Act to amend the Trust and Trustee Act. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1143, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act Bill. in relation to certain investments of public funds by public agencies. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

1184, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1308, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to community antenae television companies. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Finance Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "It is the intention of the Chair, these Bills having been read, that they will be called later on in the day for... for a vote. For what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, seek recognition?"

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Was

Senate Bill 1030 one of the Bills read off by the Clerk

1ust then? No. thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Was not."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "On page 14 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading Short Debate appears Senate Bill 78. Ms. Deuchler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 78, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 92. Mr.

Hastert or Ms. Deuchler or Ms. Cowlishaw. Out of the

record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short

Debate appears Senate Bill 98. Ms. Currie has...

alright. Out of the record. Yes, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "There is an Amendment and Representative Currie has stated that I should put the Amendment on for her, please. I'm a hyphenated Sponsor of the Amendment."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, but she is not in the... Oh, she is here, yes. Ms. Currie. Alright, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. This is on 98."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 98, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

  Currie and Ropp."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Currie, Mr. Ropp going to present that or will you? Ms. Currie, proceed."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The
  Amendment is an effort to satisfy some requirements of the
  Department of Registration and Education with respect to
  who can sit for psychology licensure exams. It's a fairly
  straightforward proposition removing some obsolete language
  and increasing the membership of the psychology committee
  within the Department. I'd be happy to answer questions
  and I would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, has moved for the adoption of House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 98. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will yield for questions."

- McCracken: "I see from my analysis that this is similar to two
  Bills which have already failed. Can you explain in more
  detail what this Bill does and if there is any opposition
  to it?"
- Currie: "As far as I know, there is no opposition. This is not similar to Senate Bill 96, which was an effort totally to restructure psychology licensure programs in the State of Illinois. This really deals, I think, only with the

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

committee within the Department and broadening the membership and it also enables people with various curriculum requirements to sit for the exam."

McCracken: "Does DRE currently have rule-making authority to regulate approved programs pursuant to this Act?"

Speaker Greiman: "Was that addressed to Ms. Ropp... Mr. Ropp?

Alright. Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would... would he restate his question, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, does DRE currently have rule-making authority to regulate the approved programs or the curriculum to determine whether or not a person is eligible to sit for the exam under current law?"

Ropp: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay, how does this change or why is it necessary then to require DRE to promulgate rules?"

"Okay, this is one of... one of the reasons to state a Ropp: specific example. There were some students who graduated from a particular university that was accredited a of years ago, and those particular students, some of which did not choose to go into the field of psychology. then, in the last few years, they have decided that they want to go into the field of psychology, but the school The current administration, who is longer operative. directing these rule-making processes, have said since the school is no longer in operation, even though they graduated, are not eligible to take the license exam and we are attempting here to, under this provision, allow people to take the exam based on the fact that they had already passed a certain amount of credited courses and this is why we need this language."

McCracken: "Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, is that it? Alright. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kulas."

Kulas: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for a question."

Kulas: "Representative Ropp, is this the same problem you and I had with... a year or two ago?"

Ropp: "You are absolutely correct and this addresses that problem and that's about all that this Amendment does."

Kulas: "Well, then I would support your Amendment. Thank you."
Speaker Greiman: "There being no further question... discussion,
the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All in

favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On Senate Bills Second Reading,

Short Debate Calendar appears Senate Bill 32. Mr. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act providing for the establishment of the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clark O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Satterthwaite."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite.

Ms. Satterthwaite appears not to be in the chamber. Yes,

Ms. Cowlishaw. What... For what purpose do you seek

recognition?"

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, if it is possible, I would be glad to present Amendment #2. It's all agreed to."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Well, I think just as a matter of good form, we should... we should probably wait rather than take this Bill out of the record for a while, if Mr. Hastert... if that's Mr. Hastert's pleasure."

Hastert: "Leave to bring this Bill back."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, we'll... We'll get back to you today."

Hastert: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Yeah, okay. On the Order of Senate Bills
Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 118. Out
of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second
Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 119. Mr. Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 119, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 131. Mr.

Hawkinson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 131, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act. Second

Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clark O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 133, Mr. Piel. Mr. Piel. Mr. Piel is not here. How will we know if the Amendments have been distributed? Well, we'll take it out of the record. Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 156. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Ropp, do you wish to proceed? 156. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 156, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments?"

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Returning in the Calendar to Senate Bill 118. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 118. Would you read the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 118, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of an Act creating the Illinois Department of
Veterans' Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 159. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 159, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 190, Ms.

Barnes. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 190, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Hastert. Well, if you will tell him, Mr. Olson, that Ms. Satterthwaite has... is here in the chamber and we could return to 92, so if he'd come... returns, we'll do that. Alright. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 192. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Davis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 192, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.
Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments? Any... I'm sorry. Any
Motions with respect to Amendments 1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 210. Out

of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second

Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 212. Nr. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 212, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Second

Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clark O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Ryder."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Jersey, Mr. Ryder, or Amendment #1."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment adds an

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

immediate effective date at the request of the Senate Sponsor.  $\ensuremath{^{\prime\prime}}$ 

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Jersey has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 212. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Could you tell us what the Bill does and why we can't wait till January 1st to have it go into effect?"

Ryder: "The Bill changes part of the Revenue Code. There is now a sales tax charge to wholesale... liquid propane sellers and this has been an anomaly in the Act as the result of some recent changes and the Senate Sponsor and I agree that we'd like to do it just as soon as possible and the Department of Revenue is also agreeable."

Cullerton: "Well, it doesn't mean'it's a good idea."

Ryder: "Of course not, but that's a nice start."

Cullerton: "Well, if it deals with the... a tax, retails...

retailers' occupation tax, wouldn't it make sense to have

it begin at the beginning of the fiscal year and what would

the effect be if it began when the Governor signed the law

two-thirds through the year?"

Ryder: "The effect is not going to be great because these folks are getting refunds on the taxes that they are paying now because they are buying wholesale and in some cases selling to folks who are not required to pay the sales tax. They are not paying... or they are paying the tax and then the tax is being refunded to them. This simply eliminates some cost, eliminates some hassle and the sooner we can do it, the greater the benefit. That, I believe, is the reason the Senate Sponsor would like to have it amended in such a fashion."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Now, we will return to Senate Bill 92. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk D'Brien: "Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Satterthwaite."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite.

Oh, have we lost Ms. Satterthwaite now? Oh, alright, she's back again."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is merely a technical Amendment. The Bill, as it was amended in Committee, referred to the City of Champaign, but more appropriately should have referred to the Urbana - Champaign area. And I move for adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Champaign - Urbana moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 92. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 218. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill. Yes? I'm sorry. Ms. Satterthwaite,

  for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Satterthwaite: "Is there permission to return Senate Bill 92 to the Consent Calendar?"
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady asks leave to return Senate Bill 92 to the Consent Calendar. I note Second Reading Second Day.

  Mr. Hastert is the Sponsor of that Bill, however, and he indicates his assent to that. So, therefore, the Gentleman has leave, using the Attendance Roll Call, to return Senate Bill 92 to Second Reading Second Day, Consent Calendar.

  Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Didrickson."

Didrickson: "I would object to that."

- Speaker Greiman: "Oh, I'm sorry. Alright. Ms. Didrickson does object to that. No, since she has objected, the Bill will remain on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading. It's been moved to Third Reading at this point. Alright. Mr... Short Debate, yes. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill Second Reading, Short Debate, 218. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 218, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 238. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 257. Mr. McGann, do you wish to proceed with that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 257, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens' Real Estate Tax Deferral

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 290. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 290, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Crime Victims' Compensation Act. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 295. Out of the record. Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 309, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 312. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Regulatory Reform Act. Second Reading of
the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 343. Mr.

Dunn, do you wish to proceed with that Bill? Mr. Dunn, I'm

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- over here. Do you wish to proceed with that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 343, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Court Reporters' Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "I ask for the adoption of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, the Gentleman from Macon has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 343. And on that, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I wanted to rise in support of the Amendment and to tell the House that this is the same as a Bill that we passed overwhelmingly that I was the Sponsor of. And apparently, it got hung up in the Senate, so we would ask that we adopt this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Mr... Purther discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "What does the Amendment do?"
- Cullerton: "It deals with the office of the... Well, perhaps I shouldn't answer that since I'm not the Sponsor."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, you wish to make inquiry of the Sponsor of the Amendment? Mr. Dunn indicates he will yield for a question."
- Dunn: "Having the Amendment ever ready just in case we need an explanation, the Amendment provides that the salary of each administrative assistant shall be determined by the Supreme Court, paid monthly from the State Treasury on warrant of the Comptroller out of appropriations for that purpose by the General Assembly. Is there further explanation needed? This is a Supreme Court recommendation, I think, with

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

regard to the salary for the administrative assistant, I think, is what it is. Yeah."

McCracken: "I agreed with the Bill when it was sponsored by Representative Cullerton. My analysis indicates that the maximum available is the same as that for court reporters though. Is that an error on our part, or is that... is that the correct formulation?"

Dunn: "Okay, the Amendment says the salary schedule shall reflect
the following factors: Experience, education, population of
the Circuit, nature and complexity of the duties, other
factors considered relevant. The maximum salaries for
administrative assistants shall be the same as maximum
salaries presently established and hereafter established
from time to time for the full time official court
reporters. You are correct."

McCracken: "Okay, and that was the same as the original Bill?"

Dunn: "I think so."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 352, Mr. Nulcahey. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 371. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 379. Mr. Tuerk. 378. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 378, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 384. Out

of the record. On the Order... On the Order of Senate...

Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill

397. Out of the record. Yes, Mr. Mulcahey, for what

purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, did you take 352 out of the record?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Mulcahey, we did."

Mulcahey: "Why?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Mulcahey, you weren't present."

Mulcahey: "Yes, I was."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey..."

Mulcahey: "If you want to take the Bill out of the record, that's fine, but ask me first, okay?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey, if you are not in your seat,
which you were not, and I look in your area and no one
seeks recognition, we take the Bill out of the record. If
you wish me to go back to it, I will. Mr. Clerk, Senate
Bill 352. Yes, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bill Short... Second Reading Short Debate appears Senate Bill 406. Mr. Levin. Out of the record temporarily. We'll get back to you. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 415. Mr. McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 415, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 416. Out

of the record. And on the Order of Senate Bills Second

Reading, Short Debate, on the top of page 16, appears

Senate Bill 422. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 422, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Bingo License and Tax Act. Second Reading
of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 432. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill... I'm sorry. Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, 432, Mr. Speaker, the fiscal note has been filed, so..."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Cullerton: "On 432, Representative Ropp is here and our only question was whether a fiscal note had been filed. It has been, so it's fine if you want to..."

Speaker Greiman: "I... Alright, Mr. Ropp has returned to the chamber then. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading,
Short Debate appears Senate Bill 432. Mr. Clerk..."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, can we have the... the Clerk read the Bill again?"

Speaker Greiman: "We were going to do that."

Cullerton: "Again, twice."

Speaker Greiman: "Again, we were going to do that, Mr. Cullerton, right now."

Cullerton: "I want everybody to listen."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Cullerton: "I want everybody to listen."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 432. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 432, a Bill for an Act in relation to the control of trichinosis in swine. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "And has the fiscal note been filed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Returning on the Calendar to page 15, Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 309. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 309."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 309, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of
the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Cullerton."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment #2."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 deletes 'order of supervision'.

The Bill deals... provides that continuation of employee group insurance coverage will not be available to an employee who is discharged for commission of a felony or a theft in connection with his employment. The discharged employee must have either admitted the crime or received a conviction. What this Amendment does is to say that if they receive supervision, since that's not a conviction,

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

that should not be included in the Bill. I believe the Sponsor is in agreement, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 309. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, my only question is under current law..."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, he'll yield for a question."

McCracken: "Thank you. Under current law, is the order of supervision enough to terminate his status? So this would be a change in the law?"

Cullerton: "I don't understand the question."

McCracken: "Is the order of supervision under current law enough to terminate the employee?"

Cullerton: "Well, I assume under current law that there is DО the discontinuation provision for of employee insurance and that's the purpose of the Bill and all I'm ... so all I'm saying is that if someone is... apparently, someone received supervision for theft, for misdemeanor theft, then they ... they wouldn't ... under this Amendment, would not be terminated, their group would not be terminated because they got What the Bill purports to do..."

McCracken: "But it would still... it would still apply, even if
he came in and plead guilty, which is an admission of
theft, and the court gave him supervision, then he wouldn't
be terminated from coverage?"

Cullerton: "Well, you know, the way that supervision is given out throughout the state, I think, differs. There may be a plea of guilty, which is then... but no finding of guilty. So, I don't know how a court would interpret this admission of... admission of the crime. Maybe they might say that

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- pleading guilty and being found not guilty is not an admission of the crime. That would be what my intent would be.  $^{\prime\prime}$
- McCracken: "Okay, and who is this Amendment agreed to or not agreed... or not opposed by?"
- Cullerton: "Well, I just suggested that perhaps the Sponsor of the Bill was not opposed to the Amendment?"
- McCracken: "Now, who is that, Sangmeister or Mautino?"
- Cullerton: "Oh, no, I didn't check with Senate."
- McCracken: "Okay, alright. Thank you."
- Cullerton: "We don't... We don't check with the Senate. They either concur or they don't."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 447. Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 447, a Bill for an Act to amend the law concerning... compensation for the individual for employment related injuries, disabilities and illnesses.

  Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Panayotovich and Giorgi."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Panayotovich, on Amendment #1. Mr. Giorgi, do you wish to take Amendment #12"
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the... Panayotovich's Amendment is the 'Buy
  American' Amendment and I don't have any objection to

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

adding that to the Bill, so I support the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebage has moved for the adoption... Yes, Mr. Giorgi, you want to take it out of the record? Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Take... Alright, the Bill will be out of the record. The Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 499. Mr. Nash. Mr. Levin. Alright, Mr. Levin is here. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 499, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Boat Registration and Safety Act. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?" .

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 518. Out

of the record. Yes, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, before Representative Stephens gets too upset, I
wonder if he might agree to taking the Bill out of the
record so we could talk to him about a possible Amendment?"

Speaker Greiman: "Oh, I didn't see Mr. Stephens over there.

Alright. Mr. Stephens, we will..."

Cullerton: "Seems to be upset."

Speaker Greiman: "... go back. What... For what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Stephens: "I will take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Take the Bill out of the record.

Thank you. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1995

Short Debate appears Senate Bill 533. Out of the record.

On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears...

Short Debate appears Senate Bill 553. Mr. McPike. Mr.

McPike. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 553, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Real Estate License Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments... Yes, Mr. McPike."
- McPike: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave to put this on Interim Study from whichever Committee it came out of... from Registration and Regulation."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, asks leave of the House to return Senate Bill 553 to the Interim Study Committee of the... Interim Study Calendar of the Committee from which it was originally referred. Gentleman has leave. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 558. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 558, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
  Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "Yes, is Amendment #1 on the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Ropp and Nash."

Cullerton: "I just have a question about the Amendment. That's all."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Ropp, the Gentleman from McLean, on Amendment #1."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #1 merely clarifies the legislative intent that we have

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- dealing with officials and having contracts with state agencies or state businesses. And that's all we are attempting to do is clarify that language."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 558. And on that, is there any question... any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, who would have a contract with the state that wouldn't be paid out of an appropriation from the state?"
- Ropp: "There might be... let's say, for example, an attorney, who might be a Legislator, might be doing business as a counsel to a small community, let's say in my area, the City of Carlock, that has about 700 people. Because the get some revenue sharing monies, they would be, in fact, a conflict of interest and we are attempting to allow that to happen. Without this Amendment, it is the feeling that that particular individual would be in violation of the current law."
- Cullerton: "Well, maybe you could describe the current law and the deficiencies in the current law."
- Ropp: "Okay. The deficiency... let's say, for example, well, we'll use our... our Leader, Representative Vinson. If he was to do... serve as counsel to the City of Clinton, this current law, as we understand it, he would be prohibited from doing that because he would, in fact, be dealing with the community that receives revenue sharing money that we appropriate."
- Cullerton: "And so, the purpose of this Amendment would be to allow Representative Vinson to represent the City of Clinton?"
- Ropp: "Yes, Sir, because we think he would do... he could do a good job for the City of Clinton."
- Cullerton: "So, the purpose of this is to allow..."

59th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Ropp: "And it might even apply to your... your own area, but particularly for..."
- Cullerton: "Okay, I'm not necessarily in disagreement with what you want to do. I just think that there might be some...

  may be some problems with the way that the Amendment is drafted, so..."
- Bopp: "Well, there's not a lot of... there's only a couple of words in it, so it's not..."
- Cullerton: "I... I know that. It's just that it... It doesn't do
  what you want it to do, I don't think. But that's fine.

  If you want to adopt it and move it to Third Reading and we
  can discuss it later. And besides, Representative Mulcahey
  is in a hurry and we are going to be here until 10:00
  tonight. We've got 12 hours to go. Let's let it go."
- Ropp: "Super, thank you. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 560. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 560, a Bill for an Act relating to taxes for libraries. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, I would ask... there's a number of Bills in the next three or four Bills that I... that are Republican

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

sponsored Bills that we have noticed there might be some technical problems and we just wanted to ask for them to take it out of the record so that we could discuss those Amendments with them. This is one such Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, alright. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish me to poll the various Members? Ms. Wojcik. Representative Cullerton has suggested that they are looking at ... there may be need for an Amendment to Senate Bill 560 and would like you to take it out of the record if that's agreeable with you and it is. So, 560 will be out of the record. that we can, perhaps, save some time, Mr. Cullerton has the same concern about Senate Bill 564. Mr. Churchill. that's alright to be out of the record? Mr. Churchill? And 570, Mr. Ewing, if we might take that out of the record for a little while? We will call these back again. is concern about as to whether an Amendment is necessary on the Bills. Mr. Ewing. Turn Mr. Ewing on."
- Ewing: "Are you talking about both 70 and 71 (sic 570 and 571)?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, as well as 601 from... that Ms. Deuchler sponsors."
- Ewing: "Okay, I assume that if your side wants to put an Amendment on, they'll contact us and give us some idea of what their thoughts are on that?"
- Speaker Greiman: "We can't put an Amendment on unless it's filed, but indeed, yes, of course. Oh, alright. Alright. Thank you, Mr. Ewing, for your cooperation. Mr... Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 601. Mr. Cullerton, I'm advised that the Amendment with relation to 601 has been filed and distributed. Is that correct? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 601, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the creation and management of forest

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

preserve districts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Deuchler."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Kane, Ms. Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the
Amendment that I am proposing is basically a technical
Amendment. There were several misspellings in the text of
the Bill and other technical areas that we have corrected."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Kane moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 601. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 616. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 616, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted previously."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The fiscal note has been filed, is that correct?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed as amended."

Speaker Greiman: "So the Bill will then be moved to Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 629. Mr.

- 58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985
  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 629, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of
  the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clark O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
  McAuliffe."
- Speaker Greiman: "Nr. Goforth, I'm advised that you are proceeding for Mr. McAuliffe, is that correct? Mr. Goforth. Mr. Goforth, you wish to withdraw Amendment #1?

  I'm sorry, that would be Amendment #2. Alright, Amendment #2 will be withdrawn. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 653. Mr. Bullock, 653. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 665, Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich, would you like that Bill called?
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 665, a Bill for an Act in relation to enterprise zones. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Terzich."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, on Amendment #1."
- Terzich: "Yes, Amendment #1 was requested by DCCA. What it simply does, it applies the tax relief for gas and electricity utility taxes only and also it would apply for

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- retention of two thousand jobs rather than four hundred and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 665. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker. Could the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."
- Piel: "Yeah, we got it. I wouldn't have asked the guestion if that was the case, Sharon. You mentioned that it was raising the job figure from four hundred to two thousand.

  Could you explain exactly what that does?"
- Terzich: "Yeah, the... for the state and municipal tax exemption, this Amendment requires business investments which cause the retention of at least two thousand jobs rather than four hundred full time jobs and this was requested by DCCA and also the Governor's Office."
- Piel: "I'm sorry. It was suggested by whom?"
- Terzich: "The DCCA and also from the Governor's Office on this request. It... It tightens it up. In other words, with... rather than retention of two (sic four) hundred jobs, it increases it to two thousand jobs.""
- Piel: "Thank you very much. No further questions."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further questions, question is,

  'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye',

  those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
  'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further

  Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 653. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 653, a Bill for an Act to amend

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Sections of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in

Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. And the fiscal note has been filed, yes?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 690. Mr. Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 690, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of
the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Notions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Beading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 738. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 738, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts and remove
obstructions in the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Tate."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Tate. Mr. Terzich, what is your pleasure?"

Terzich: "I'm ready."

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Terzich: "Let her rip."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Terzich, you would have to make a Motion to table Amendment #1."

Terzich: "Oh, I do? Alright, then I make a Motion to table

Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich,
moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 738. All those
in... yes. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr.
McCracken."

McCracken: "Can we take it out of the record for a moment? Mr.

Tate is temporarily indisposed. Temporarily indisposed.

The guy who scored the winning run should be in a good mood."

Terzich: "A little sore but in a good mood. Am I taking this...
I'll take it out of the record."

Speaker Grieman: "Mr. Terzich, you'll take that out of the record?"

Terzich: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 739. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 739, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts and remove
obstructions in Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 755. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 792. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 792, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading

of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 796. Slater, do you wish that ... this Bill called? Out of We will return to Senate Bill Second Reading Short record. Debate 738. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Well, Mr. Terzich... Mr. Terzich is there. Alright. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 739, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts and remove
obstructions in the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Tate."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Tate, on Floor
Amendment #1."

Tate: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 1 addresses a problem which is a legal problem that dates back to a statute in 1896 that essentially alleviates any liability sanitary districts would have in digging lines through residential areas and adversely affecting residential areas and their water. We had a specific problem in Decatur in the last two years where the sanitary district drove a line through a neighborhood block which all the neighborhood homes water was supplied by wells. All the wells dried up at that point after the line was dug thirty feet down and the sanitary district presently is claiming no liability to it.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

What we had hoped to do is... and the sanitary district has agreed that if this law is changed, they could accept the legal implications of it and, therefore, replace the dried up wells in the neighborhood and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 738. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Tate, could you explain the status of the legal proceedings with regard to the sanitary district in Decatur right now? What's the status? Has there been a law suit filed?"

Tate: "I believe there has been a law suit filed, Representative Cullerton, although I'm not absolutely confident of that. It was a local neighborhood which had... that has organized for this case and I'm not absolutely sure whether they have contracted with... I know they have contracted with an attorney. I don't know whether they have filed at this point."

Cullerton: "Well, I'm just wondering what the need for this

Amendment is. I mean, if they... can they... can they sue
them right now? Is that what the problem is?"

Tate: "Well... Well, I mean... the needs of it is even if they sue these people, the sanitary district's... their own attorneys are claiming that because of the 1917 Sanitary District Act, that they have no liability. And what... exactly what's happened was we are extending a sewer line through another municipality and some unincorporated areas and in those unincorporated areas, the sewer line went right through the water reservoir and as a result, it... the water table dropped. The wells dried up in these neighborhoods and the district claims no liability because

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

of the Sanitary District Act of 1917."

- Cullerton: "Well, you mean because of sovereign immunity?"
- Tate: "No, because they have no liability from past court cases that have already been tested."
- Cullerton: "Because of the doctrine of sovereign immunity that
  the sanitary district is immune from liability because it's
  a sovereign creature of the state?"
- Tate: "Well, I... from my understanding, it's from a provision in percolating waters which says that sanitary districts are not liable... do you understand percolating waters?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, I'm reading the definition. It means waters which ooze, seep, filter or percolate through the ground under the surface without a definite channel or on a course that is uncertain or unknown and not discoverable from the surface without excavation for that purpose."

Tate: "Correct."

- Cullerton: "And what the Bill... what the Amendment seems to do is to say that any sanitary district organized under the Sanitary District Act of 1917, which intercepts or impedes percolating waters under the surface and which causes injury to adjoining properties shall be liable for civil damages. Now, let me ask you this. Does this apply to all sanitary districts in the state?"
- Tate: "Just the ones organized under the Sanitary Act of 1917."

  Cullerton: "And does that... would that include the Metropolitan

  Sanitary District?"

Tate: "No."

Cullerton: "Okay, no further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 796. Mr.

Slater. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 796, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton. Are there... Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 815."

Cullerton: "Out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton, I haven't called on you."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that..."

Speaker Greiman: "I haven't called on you. Mr. Cullerton, yes."

Cullerton: "My mike was on. This was a Bill that was on the way

to the Governor's desk last night and we retrieved it and

brought it back and plopped it right down in the Calendar.

So, we are going to try to help Representative Churchill

pass it again with an Amendment. So, we'd ask that he'd

take it out of the record so that we could do that."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Churchill, being ever concilliatory, takes it out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 818. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 818, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Second Reading
of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 829. Ms.

  Barnes in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 829, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Barnes."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, on Amendment #1."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 829 is the result of an agreement between the Department of Registration and Education. the Illinois State Medical Illinois Hospital Association. and the Amendment provides the Medical Examining Committee with the authority to compell mental and physical examinations of applicants upon a showing of possible incapacity. physical examinations may also be required of individuals seeking a two year temporary certificate of registration. Amendment 1 also modernizes language concerning substance and alcohol abuse and modernizes language concerning mental illness. Finally. Amendment 1 amends the Hospital Licensing Act to require that individuals serving clerkships in hospitals be enrolled in an approved medical college."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 829, and is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills
  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 830. Out
  of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second
  Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 831. Mr. Clerk,
  read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 831, a Bill for an Act in relation to conveyance of public land. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Churchill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Churchill... Lake,
  Mr. Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ploor Amendment #1 is something that allows the Department of Conservation to enter into a long-term 99 year lease for the purpose of recreating a historical restoration of a building that was originally built by the Canal Commission back years ago and it's a reconstruction. And this is something that's going on the National Register of Historic Places and I would seek the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 831. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Churchill: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes."

- Churchill: "This had been a Bill that was on the Consent Calendar and we brought it back for the purpose of this Amendment.

  May I have leave of the Body to..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to place Senate Bill 831 on the Consent Calendar Second Reading Second Day. The Gentleman have leave? You have leave, Sir. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 844. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Hawkinson."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson, on Amendment #1."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is the same as the House Bill that was sponsored by Representative Koehler. As amended, this conforms it to the House version in line with our discussions in Judiciary Committee. It adds to the offense of escape failure to report for periodic imprisonment and it deletes language that we just... that Representative Younge raised a point about in Committee and I think it's an agreed Amendment. I would ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 844. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
  Hawkinson."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson, on Amendment #2."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 adds Section...

  a new Section 12 to Section 12.4 of the aggravated battery
  statute covering employees of the Illinois Department of
  Children and Family Services. I would ask for its
  adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson, moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 844. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 847. Mr.

  Saltsman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 847, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act.
  Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Saltsman, on
  Amendment #1."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Mr..."
- Saltsman: "All that this Bill does is it makes the auditor not

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- the chief financial executive of the county and it pulls out Section 4 of the Bill. Can we take this out of the record and hold it, please?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, we'll take it out of the record then.

  Thanks. Alright, on page 18 of the Calendar, Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 861. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 861, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the State Employees' Group Insurance Act.

  Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
  Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
  Cullerton."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment #2."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This inserts language to clarify in Amendment #1 that Amendment #1 applies only to group insurance benefits, as does the original Bill. So, it's really just a technical Amendment. Move for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 861. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Jersey, Mr. Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and as Sponsor of the Bill, I accept the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Speaker. Further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 864. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 864, a Bill for an Act in relation to the composition of certain agricultural committees. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 865.

Clerk, read the Bill. No. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk.

Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 875. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 882. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 982, a Bill for an Act to create the Expedited Check Clearing Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions respect to Amendment #12"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 891. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 891, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Pharmacy Practice Act. Second Reading of
the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Churchill and Nash."

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, on Amendment #1. Mr. Churchill. Mr. Stephens, what's your pleasure? Mr. Nash, you are... you are also a Sponsor of that Amendment. Yes, Mr. Stephens."
- Stephens: "I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, we have a process here, Mr. Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Nash, do you wish to proceed with the Amendment? Alright, Mr. Nash is recognized on Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 891. Mr. Hastert, for what purpose are you seeking recognition? Mr. Churchill, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Churchill: "I'm prepared to proceed with Amendment #1 if you are prepared, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, the Speaker is prepared. Mr. Churchill, proceed, either you or Mr. Nash may proceed on this. Go ahead."
- Churchill: "All Amendment #1 does is to add an immediate effective date to this Bill. I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 891.

  And on that, is there any discussion? There being none...

  Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I just wondered if Mr. Piel was... was on his toes on this one."
- Speaker Greiman: "Has the Amendment not been printed and distributed?"
- Cullerton: "Okay, no problem. Yeah, we just didn't have a copy of the Amendment, but he's explained it as being the effective date and... are we going to see this Bill again?

  No, okay, fine."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 893. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 893, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Motions with respect to Amendment 1."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Floor Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Hastert and Woodyard."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert, on Amendment #2."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this does is amend the...

it's a... the whole Bill is a cleanup and what the
Amendment does is further clean up paragraphs 443 and 445,

of the retailers' occupation tax, and provides that a claim
for credit may be filed where a taxpayer and the Department
have agreed to an extension of time."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 993. And on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' For the... Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 894. Mr.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 894, a Bill for an Act relating to certain debts owed to the state and amending certain Acts herein named. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Vinson."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, on Amendment #1. Yes, Mr. McCracken, Gentleman from DuPage.
Mr. Vinson is here now. Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 894 creates a review Assembly. board in the Office of the Comptroller to ensure the timely and cost-efficient issuance of agency, department and elected officer annual reports. I think most Members in this chamber from time to time have a difficult time handling their mail because of the volume of reports that these various agencies that we have created issue. And think if you go through those reports, you find that many of them are far more lavish and expansive than need be. As a matter of fact, some of them deal with... some of deal with things that the agency doesn't even have any responsibility for. I can't remember which one, but I saw one of those annual reports just the other day that had pictures and language in it that related to barbed wire and it wasn't the Department of Agriculture's report. just... the officer decided to issue a report that talked about barbed wire. I think that what we need to do is to create a central mechanism in the state which controls the cost of these things. Something for the taxpayer. 1 believe that that's appropriate in the Office of the Comptroller, and we ought to augment and enhance that

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

office. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1 because it will save money."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeWitt moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 894. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Cullerton: "Good morning, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Good to see you, Mr. Cullerton. I wish you would go back to my office for a couple of minutes. I've got somebody back there that would like to meet you."

Callerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will yield, but on the floor here, not in his office."

Cullerton: "Representative Vinson..."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Cullerton: "I see that the title that you have choosen for this is a board, is that correct?"

Vinson: "A what?"

Cullerton: "Well, the title that you have choosen is the Office of the Comptroller... no, I'm sorry... the Comptrollers or Comptrollers, I'm not sure..."

Vinson: "Annual Report Review Board."

Cullerton: "Right. Now, why did you choose to call it a board rather than a commission?"

Vinson: "I'm against commissions."

Cullerton: "What is the difference between a board and a commission?"

Vinson: "Boards are executive and commissions are legislative.

Boards are good and commissions are bad."

Cullerton: "This is an executive board?"

Vinson: "Yeah, this is an executive board."

Cullerton: "And let me ask you this then. Why do we have four

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

members appointed by the... each by the Speaker, the Minority Leader and the President and Minority Leader of the Senate? Are those executive appointments or legislative appointments?"

Vinson: "Those appointments will serve an executive purpose."

Cullerton: "Okay, now how do you pronounce this, by the way?

Comptroller or comptroller?"

Vinson: "Comptroller."

Cullerton: "How about treasurer?"

Vinson: "What?"

Cullerton: "Treasurer or treasurer?"

Vinson: "I'm not interested."

Cullerton: "Which position have you declared your candidacy for, the treasurer or the comptroller?"

Vinson: "Davis is going to be the treasurer."

Cullerton: "Any you are going to be the comptroller?"

Vinson: "Maybe."

Cullerton: "I see. So you... So you are creating a new office under which, if you were the comptroller, you would be the chairman?"

Vinson: "No, I'd never be the comptroller. I may be the comptroller, if I'm lucky, but I'll never be the comptroller."

Cullerton: "I see. So we are going with comptroller. Now, have
you checked this Amendment with Representative Hastert and
with Senator Ethridge?"

Vinson: "No, as a matter of fact, I haven't. I view these Bills as property of the public, not property of the Sponsors."

Cullerton: "Well, the reason why I ask is because I believe that you amend the title of their Bill."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I missed that question."

Cullerton: "I believe that your Amendment amends the title of their Bill which may potentially jeopardize it and then..."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Vinson: "It's alright. I got another one coming that will change it back."

Cullerton: "But will also put it back to Second Reading First

Legislative Day."

Vinson: "Well, not unless you do that to them. Now, why would you do that to them?"

Cullerton: "Any Nember, upon the demand of any Member, this could go back. And it seems to me this is..."

Vinson: "None of ours are going to do that."

Cullerton: "I see. Do you have control over there of all the Members?"

Vinson: "No, but we think over here."

Cullerton: "I see. Well, it looks like a commission to me, which is really called a board. Would these people be..."

Vinson: "Do you think that... Do you think that we ought to let these agencies keep wasting money on these annual reports?

Is that what you are saying?"

Cullerton: "I really don't know."

Vinson: "You know... You know darn well we shouldn't do that."

Cullerton: "Alright, let me ask you. Are these people... Are these people on this board to be compensated in any way, for their expenses, perhaps, travel expenses?"

Vinson: "We thought we'd leave that to the Supreme Court by rule.

I don't think they are supposed to be compensated. I

didn't want them compensated."

Cullerton: "I see. Well, I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Vinson: "Are you for this?"

Cullerton: "I have no further questions."

Vinson: "But are you for it?"

Cullerton: "I haven't decided yet."

Vinson: "I'd like you to be for it. Will you be for it?"

Cullerton: "Do you want a Roll Call?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Vinson: "What?"

Cullerton: "Do you want a Roll Call?"

Vinson: "Well, if you are for it, we don't need one."

Cullerton: "Okay, I'm not going to request a Roll Call."

Vinson: "Are you going to vote for it?"

Cullerton: "If it's a voice vote, yes."

Vinson: "You going to vote for it on Third Reading?"

Cullerton: "I don't know yet."

Vinson: "Why would you have a problem with it?"

Cullerton: "Hello?"

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Alright. Mr. Cullerton, have you concluded?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I have."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Mr. Vinson, to close. Have you closed?"

Vinson: "Mr. Cullerton, Mr. Speaker said that we would have a voice vote on this and that he'd vote for it on a voice vote."

Speaker Greiman: "He's allowing a voice vote today. I see.
Alright. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'
Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.
In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it... the 'nays' have it... Well, apparently we are going to need a... Yes, Mr. Cullerton, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Cullerton: "Was the Amendment adopted or not?"

Speaker Greiman: "No, I... there were... It will fail according to my auditory powers."

Cullerton: "Right. No questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Vinson, were you asking for a Roll Call vote?"

Vinson: "Well, you told me that we were going to voice vote it on."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, well, then the Amendment fails then."

Vinson: "But you told me we were going to put it on with a voice vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, I have to listen to the conscience of the Body, Mr. Vinson. You want to try it again? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Well, in the opinion of the Chair..."

Vinson: "Tell... tell... He promised me that he would vote for it."

Speaker Greiman: "I think he did. He yelled with the 'ayes'. In the opinion of the Chair..."

Vinson: "Let's have a Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "In the opinion of the Chair, we'll have a Roll Call vote. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 53 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Yes, Mr. Hastert, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hastert: "I was standing over on the other side of the aisle when
we passed over 865. I wonder if we could return to that
while we're right there."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Olson took that out of the record."

Hastert: "He couldn't see me. I don't know how he missed me."

Speaker Greiman: "But Mr. Olson is the Sponsor."

Hastert: "Alright."

Speaker Greiman: "He took it out of the record. I only looked at Mr. Olson at that time. Alright. We will... We have a Motion here. Leave... because of the shortness of the time between now and the deadline, we placed Senate Bill 831 on

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the Consent Calendar Second Day, Second Reading. In order for it to be heard and voted upon, it will have to be placed on the Order of Consent Calendar Third Reading, First Day. Similarly, Senate Bill 829 was on the Consent Calendar originally and was taken off for the purposes of an Amendment. Accordingly, with leave of the House, using the Attendance Roll Call, we will place Senate Bills 829 and 831 on the Order of Consent Calendar Third Reading, First Day. Have leave? Leave of the House. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 907. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 907, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by... or Amendment #1
was withdrawn. No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 941. Mr.

Clerk, read the... Mr. Levin? Mr. Levin, 941? Mr. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 941, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Guardianship and Advocacy Act. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 983. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill. Ms. Braun, do you wish to proceed

with that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 983, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.
No Committee Amendments."

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills
  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1004.
  Mr. Homer? 1004? Out of the record. On the Order of
  Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate
  Bill 1030. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of dentistry in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Braun."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, on Amendment
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 simply provides that dental hygienists should undertake continuing education in their respective field. Twenty-four hours of continuing education. I encourage your support".
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1030. Is there any discussion?

  The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, could the Lady repeat what the Amendment does?

  I'm sorry, I did not hear."
- Braun: "I'm sorry, John. Simply continuing education for dental hygienists. Twenty-four hours of continuing education in their field."

Cullerton: "Continuing education?"

Braun: "Right."

Cullerton: "For dental hygienists?"

Braun: "Right."

Cullerton: "This Bill deals with the dentists."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Braun: "Right."

Cullerton: "And the rewrite of the Dental Practice Act. And apparently your Amendment, which is about a page and a half long, deals with dental hygienists?"

Braun: "Right."

Cullerton: "Now, it seems to me that there's been a trend in the past couple years to get away from requiring continuing education for most professions. Rather than have the state mandate that there be this education, it may be construed as being an attempt within the industry or the profession to protect some jobs or protect certain people who are entrenched and keep others out. I know that the people who have been working on this Bill have this concept. They are opposed to the Amendment. Senate, I believe, considered Amendments to this Bill. I \* m not sure if this was one of them or not, but I would rise in opposition to the proposed Amendment and ask Members of the House to please defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she'll yield for a question."

Harris: "Representative, a quick question. Do the dentists have a continuing education requirement?"

Braun: "Who's asking the question? I'm sorry."

Harris: "Representative Harris, in the back, Carol."

Braun: "Oh, okay. Pardon?"

Harris: "Do the dentists have a continuing education requirement?"

Braun: "I'm not... I don't know, Representative. I don't know the answer to that question."

Harris: "Alright. I do not believe they do, and I'm surprised that we're asking that the dental hygienists have a

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

continuing education requirement."

Braun: "Well, these are primarily women who work in the dental labs. It should not be a problem. It does not... This Amendment doesn't interfere at all with what the dentists do. What it relates to are, again, women, again primarily. There are some male dental hygienists, but they are primarily women who are in need of additional... you know, to have... the reason for the continuing education is to give these women an opportunity to uplift themselves."

Harris: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. Senate Bill 1030 is one that's been worked on for a long period of time, something that was heard in the Committee of which I am the Minority Spokesman. There were attempts in the Committee to try and amend the Bill and try and put it into a different form. I believe that the form that Senate Bill 1030 is in right now is the form that it ought to remain in. And, therefore, I would rise in strong opposition to placing this and the subsequent Amendments on this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, to close."

Braun: "Thank you very much. I'm really sorry that the dentists feels... that the heavy weight of the Dental Association has reared up against this Amendment. It's really unfortunate, because this is not a turf battle. This does not interfere with them. It does not interfere in any way with what the dentists do or will not do. All it does is provide for people who work in these offices to have the training adequate to do their job. And I would encourage your support for the Amendment on those grounds."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it, and the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Matijevich."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Matijevich, excuse me just one second. I would like to announce to the Body that we have in the gallery representatives from Illini Girls' State who are here with us today. We recognize you, and we hope that you will enjoy participating here in this great democratic institution. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on Amendment #2."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen οf the Amendment #2 restores the status quo as it relates to the supervision of dental hygienists. For the past fifteen dental hygienists have functioned safely and vears. effectively under the current Dental Practice Act. For the past three years, the Act and rules of the Department of Registration and Education have provided a framework for providing access to care for persons in long term care hospitals and other similar institutions. I offer this Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because, when I said that for the past fifteen years we have been operating under what now I am trying to do to keep the status quo, I was the Sponsor of the Bill that provided the dental hygienists to be able to operate these general supervision and under the direction of a licensed dentist. I think the Dental Society makes a big mistake when they don't include the dental hygienists in the function and role of providing preventive health care. I think also that the Dental Society really invites a lawsuit from the Dental Hygienists' Association if don't keep the status quo. I'm one who ordinarily does

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

follow the recommendations of the Dental Society; but, when they're wrong, I like to tell them that they're wrong. When you tell me that you ve spent a lot of time underwriting this Act, what you're telling me is Dental Society spent a lot of time writing the Act. T # m going back fifteen years. I was a part of that compromise. I want to tell you that that was in the best interests people who want proper dental health care. That's what we ought to be voting for. We should not be voting for or against the Dental Society. We ought to be voting for what's in the best interests of the consumer, the one wants to make sure that their teeth are in the best And I think if you are voting on that, then you will vote for this Amendment. Don't vote for or against the Dental Society. Don't vote for or against the Dental Hygienists Association either. Vote in the best interests of all of the people. If you do, you will wote for this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1030. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with Representative Matijevich that should not vote for or against a Bill because of the ... just simply because of the lobbying groups that opposed and we should look at the merits of the Amendment or the merits of the Bill. And when we do that, particular case, we would, I think, reach the conclusion that this Amendment should be rejected. The original Bill, the Bill that passed the Senate and the Bill that came through Committee and the Bill that, in Committee, no one would even offer this Amendment because it's really not in the best interest of patients, the original Bill said that

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

hygienists may practice only under the supervision of a And what this Amendment does is to say under the general supervision of a dentist. And what that, says is that it gives more autonomy to a dental hygienist and allows for that hygienist to possibly work possibly harm a patient because there's not. the supervision of a dentist available. It also expands the current law, not the status quo, but expands the current law to allow a hygienist to practice under the general supervision of a dentist in a hospital or other similar institutions; whereas, now this is limited to a long term care facility licensed by the state. It also expands the amount of time that ... from 90 days to 180 davs hygienists can carry out orders of a dentist. again, it's a weakening of the protections for the patient that are built into the Bill. So, for those reasons, I would ask the House to reject Amendment #2 and to vote it down."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,

Mr. Churchill"

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I again rise in opposition this Amendment, and I couldn't agree more with Representative Cullerton. We should look at Amendments basis of their merits and not on the basis of who supports or objects to the Amendment. And I believe, as does Representative Cullerton, that on the merits of this Amendment, we should defeat it. You know, when you go into your dentist's office and you see a dental hygienist and you have your teeth cleaned, the thing that occurs after that is that the dentist comes in and takes a look in mouth and checks out to see if you have any diseases of the mouth, if you're going to lose any teeth, if there may be cancer forming in the mouth and provides a check for which

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the dentist has been trained for years and has practiced for years and kept up with education to make sure that you, as the patient, are given the greatest treatment, the treatment that you can be provided. What this Amendment does is says that the dental hygienists don't have to under the direct supervision of that dentist. Τn extrapolating the Amendment, we can see that what would occur would be that dental hygienists could form their own association, their own group and go out and perhaps have a general... one dentist who is in general supervision of them and perhaps set up ten or twelve hygienist clinics, but there would be no dentist. I mean, it could... the situation could develop where there would be no dentist that office to check out and see if there were any problems developing from your lack of care or your care. This is a dangerous thing for the public if we permit this Amendment. It's another Amendment that we talked about in the Committee. It's an Amendment that we did not put on this Bill, we did not want to put on this Bill. I would in opposition. I would ask all the Members of this Body to take a close look at this and to vote 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Natijevich, to close."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now Representative Churchill said that the dentists... a while or after a dental hygienist inspects you and does work in your mouth, that the dentist then checks it out. Now, I'm sure that all of you have been to a dentist. You've have a dental hygienist do some work. If that's true, if that is true, vote against my Amendment. All of you know that that's not true. That is just not true. The fact of the matter is that the dentist has general supervision of the work of the dental hygienist, and she works under the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

direction of the dentist. That is the status quo. Now I've heard Gordy Ropp on the floor of the House say many, many times, 'If it ain't broke, don't fix it'. Now, I to tell you dentists in the State of Illinois it ain to Don't fix it. What are you worried about? worried about the fact that the dental hygienists practice preventive dental health care, the fact that you're not going to make more money on cavities and bad teeth? Is that what you're worried about? Well, I think, if you won't vote against this Amendment, you are voting for that don't think you believe that. I'd ask for a Roll Call vote and vote for this Amendment. It's a good It's for preventive health care, and I appreciate your vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Zeke. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 13 voting 'aye', 87 voting 'no', 10 voting 'present', and the Amendment does fail. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #3, LeFlore, amends Senate Bill 1030."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. LeFlore, on Amendment #3."
- LePlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 (sic #3) to Senate Bill 1030 will restore the original sunset provision so that the Illinois Legislators, as well as the public, may review the health care profession in conjunction with the review of all other health care professions over the next two years. This provision is designed to ensure that the..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. LePlore. Ladies and Gentlemen

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

of the House, please give the Gentleman your attention and cut down the cross talk. Mr. LeFlore, proceed."

- LeFlore: "This provision is designed to ensure that the highest quality in health care is available to the Illinois public. A review of the dental hygiene profession would also occur during a period of time. What I can see this Amendment doing is asking that the public and House of Representatives have a chance to review the sunset provision of the particular law that is on the books now. So what I will ask is a favorable vote on this Amendment. and I'm open for questions."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. LeFlore, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1030. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would admit that this is kind of tempting; because, if this Amendment passed, we could get the... try to pass this Bill again next year. But as a practical matter, the current Act is going to sunset in 1987. The effect of this Amendment would be to have this Bill sunset in 1987. And I don't think it's really a good policy to have us continue to come back down here and try to have to go through the long process of passing a practice Act that's... will be worked on for so long. So I would rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in addition to that, I believe that the Bill that we passed out of the House dealing with sunset provides that the four Legislative Leaders will, within six months of the effective date of the Bill, will once again decide the sunset for all

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- agencies, including this. So, regardless of what we put on the Bill, we may decide to change that in six months anyway."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
  Mr. Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding the former you, Gentleman's remarks about being able to change this. the purpose of sunset was was to give us a chance to look at all of these Acts. It was something that was done so we wouldnot have to come back here every year and deal with Acts, that we could clean them up at one time, put them into effect for a period of time and then iust be that way. This is scheduled pursuant to the Bill to sunset in 1995, which would be ten years from that's the appropriate time that has been dealt with in all past Bills. This would just seek to have us start all over and turn around and renew our investigation and go through all of the process again next year. It's ridiculous to even put this Amendment on. I would rise in opposition. And again, I would ask everybody to vote loudly and strongly to oppose this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. LeFlore, to close."
- LeFlore: "Nr. Speaker, I'd just move for the adoption of the Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?'
  All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed
  'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nays' have it, and
  the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Churchill, amends Senate Bill 1030."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, on Amendment #4."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Churchill: "I would move to withdraw Amendment #4."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendment?"

  Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills
  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1031.

  Mr. Clerk. Yes, Mr. Nash, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Nash: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill, 1030, was on Consent Calendar. I ask leave of the Body to put it back on the Consent Calendar, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are we talking about 1030? The Gentleman Cook. Nash, asks leave of the House Mr. using the Attendance Roll Call to return Senate Bill 1030 Order of Consent Calendar Third Reading, First Day. the Gentleman have leave? Mr. Matijevich objects. Gentleman does not have leave. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1031. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1031, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "A Motion. Motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate
  Bill 1031, filed by Representative Hensel."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hensel, on Amendment... on a Notion to table Amendment #1."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just move to table Amendment \$1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage has moved to table
  Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1031. Is there any discussion?
  Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Hensel: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

they felt that that

Cullerton: "Representative Hensel, the Amendment that you wish to table was offered in the Judiciary Committee by yourself."
Hensel: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Was that done at the request of some Committee Members or was it just your idea to amend it in Committee?" Hensel: "Well, it was the feeling of the staff people that the Amendment that was put on in the Senate was unnecessary, and so what the Amendment did was delete the Amendment that the Senate put in. After speaking to the people that would

like to have this Bill passed,

Amendment that the Senators put on would clarify that the Bill would definitely then include sheriffs' and coroners' fees, and they felt that it would be better to have that in the Bill just for clarification purposes. And so I've just... going by their wishes to put that back in so it

Cullerton: "Well, I think that the staff person for the Republicans in Judiciary I is probably one of the best lawyers working in State Government. And if it was his idea to put your Amendment on... what you're saying is that the Senate... some Senate staffer overruled his original opinion?"

Hensel: "No."

would then..."

Cullerton: "That troubles me, because..."

Hensel: "No. No, I didn't say that. I said that the people that are asking for this Bill, not the Senate staff people. It was offered by the Sponsor in the Senate that to clarify the Bill, that they wanted to make sure that sheriffs and coroners were included. And I think it's duplicative, but they felt it should be in, and I don't see it would harm the Bill any if it were included in it. So, I'm asking to table it."

Cullerton: "Okay. I have no objection to you tabling it. But

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

what I think what we'll do is we'll have our staff look at it a little closer; and, if we have a problem on Third Reading, we can perhaps talk to you about bringing it back again."

Hensel: "Thank you. I'd appreciate that. And if it's the feeling of the House, why, we can put the Amendment back on."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, have you talked to our staffer, Art Harrison, about this Motion?"

Hensel: "Yes, I have."

Hawkinson: "And what's his feeling?"

Hensel: "Well, he thinks that the Amendment probably should go on, but the people that... in Kane County felt that it should be left to include the sheriffs. So, I was just going by their wishes."

Hawkinson: "Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment... to the Motion. I would rise in opposition to I think that the Amendment that we put on the Motion. deleting the language 'sheriff, coroner or other' necessary. The statutes already provide for fees when service is... process is done by a sheriff. And I think that this would present a potential conflict, not just be merely duplicative. And for that reason, I would oppose the Motion to table and ask for a Roll Call."

Hensel: "Speaker, if it's the..."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Hensel. What purpose are you seeking recognition? I'm going to give you an opportunity to close now if you wish."

Hensel: "Thank you. In closing, I'd like to just say that if it's the feeling of the House, rather than have a Roll Call vote, I'll just withdraw the Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Table... Gentleman withdraws the Motion to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

table Amendment #1. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1041.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1041, a Bill for an Act concerning accounting systems for units of local government. Second Reading of this Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Ploor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1093.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1093, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Cullerton, amends Senate
  Bill..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment #1."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is basically a cleanup Amendment. It deals with a criminal offense of unlawful procurement of an absentee ballot, and it strikes some words such as 'commands' and 'encourages' and provides that a person who knowingly requests another person to make a false statement in an application for an absentee ballot, with the intent to procure an absentee ballot from another, commits this offense. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1093. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We accept Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1093."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1096.
  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1096, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Ploor Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1110.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1110, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to firearms and firearm ammunition. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are none."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1111.

  Mr. Mays, 1111. Mr. Mays with us? Mr. Clerk, read the

  Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act to amend the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Phelps - et al, amends Senate
Bill 1111."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps, on Amendment 2."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe Amendment 2 just adds
the language that the... soybeans and other grains that
this left out that the original House Bill put in. This
restores that language to include other grains, rather than
just sweetcorn."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Saline moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1111. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Mays: "Is this Amendment similar to a House Bill that we passed out of this House?"

Phelps: "Yes, it is."

Mays: "What was that Bill number?"

Phelps: "I believe it's 889... 892."

Mays: "What was the vote on that Bill?"

Phelps: "I'm sorry?"

Mays: "What was the vote on that Bill that we passed out?"

Phelps: "I don't recall."

Mays: "In your opinion, do you think this will enhance the passage of this fine piece of legislation if this Amendment is attached to it?"

Phelps: "Naturally, or I wouldn't have offered it."

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Mays: "Thank you very much. I rise in support of the Amendment."

  Phelps: "Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

  Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of
  the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Mautino, amends Senate Bill
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, on Amendment #2 (sic #3)."
- Hautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment..."
- Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry. Amendment #3."
- Mautino: "Amendment #3 removes Section 5.106 of the Illinois

  Vehicle Code as adopted by this General Assembly. It

  addresses the hours of business and days that an individual

  may be open in the car business, and I move for its
  adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1111. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you might want to take a good look at this Amendment. This is the old Sunday closing law Amendment. This is the one that was up as a Bill, House Bill 20, I believe, that was brought before this Body and was debated at full length, and we defeated that Bill. This is now back to us on this Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1111. I rise in opposition, as I did to House Bill 20, and I would ask the Members to pay attention, to know what's going on so that Mr. Mautino, who tried very carefully to talk about the Vehicle Code as was very careful not to mention that

#### 58th Legislative Day

ì

June 20, 1985

- this was the Sunday closing law, he was very careful not to do those things, that everybody understands what he's trying to do. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Mr. Panayotovich, of Cook,
  Gentleman from Cook."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."
- Panayotovich: "Representative Mautino, is my... over here. Is my esteemed colleague correct in what he said?"
- Mautino: "Well, not exactly. I did mention that it addresses the hours and the days that a person in the car business could This is... be open. This is the buy American, buy on Sunday Bill. This allows... This allows for the new and car dealers in this state to operate on Sunday, which is the American way to continue the free enterprise system. As you know, I was opposed to that legislation which was enacted. This Amendment would allow for the free enterprise system to continue and to, instead of the restrain of trade, and to allow those individuals who do desire to stay open on Sunday to be open on Sunday for the consumers of this state."
- Panayotovich: "So, in other words, you answered my question that the my colleague on the other side of the aisle was correct in what he said; that this is the Sunday opening law, and I stand in opposition to this. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Well, the board seems to have lit up a bit. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe we better have a Roll Call on this one."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are you joined by the appropriate number, Mr.
  ... Yes, alright. The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. My good neighbor to the west, Representative Mautino. It's been described as as free enterprise Amendment. Can also be described, perhaps, as a common market Amendment, common in the sense that we should have a standard law for all people doing retailing in this state. We don't want to regulate pizza parlors and laundry mats. And, therefore, I'd urge strong support for this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Vitek."

Vitek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had to follow Olson because of a neighbor, but I love Dick Mautino, but I still have to vote against his Amendment. Vote 'no' on Amendment 3."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Leverenz: "When this Amendment was a Bill, how many 'yes' votes did it qet?"

Mautino: "It had... the last time it was called, it had 50 affirmative votes and 4 in the woods."

Leverenz: "Wasn't it... It wasn't down around 20 or so, or was that the Bill number?"

Mautino: "It was 50. The Bill number was 20."

Leverenz: "But it didn't pass."

Mautino: "I'm giving everyone the opportunity to erectify themselves."

Leverenz: "And that..."

Mautino: "And to have no confusion on the floor."

Leverenz: "You... You bring forth this Amendment simply to prove that nothing ever dies in Springfield."

Mautino: "Not in... Not before July 4th or 5th anyway."

Leverenz: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, this

Gentleman has offered this Amendment. He has done so much

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

for me in the last 24 hours, some of which I can't talk about. But on this Amendment, very similar to what I say about some Bills, we shall not amend any Bill before its time either. I would hope we get some red votes."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Laurino: "Is this the last time you'll offer this? To the ... To Ladies and Gentlemen, the Amendment, Nr. Speaker. appears that this is a one-sided fight. The people that are in favor of this want to sell cars, but they don't want to service them. Their argument seems a little specious. They turn around and say that the public can't get to their businesses on a busy weekday, but they need the weekends to get to the businesses so they can purchase their cars and But the same argument doesn't hold true shop around. they try to defend the fact that they are not open for service on the weekends because they feel that it's against the union. But they don't even put into effect an alternating factor where they can have some of their mechanics on duty trying to service the people that probably can't get to their place of employment easier on the weekend. So, I think that this is a bad Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kulas."
Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Kulas moves the previous question be put.

Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question be put. Mr.... Mr. Mautino, the Gentleman from Bureau, to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I notice that we're getting a lot more people on the House floor and that's...

### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

think I provided a service to the General Assembly with this Amendment. I think there's a lot of interest mainly because it's a very controversial issue. We have a situation in this state today where we have applied to the General Motors Corporation, in the terms of trying to lure the Saturn Corporation, the Saturn Company and the building of vehicles under that auspices in the State of Illinois. Yet, at the same time, we have a statute in this state that says, yes, we want you to come here and build cars in Illinois, want you to produce those cars on Sunday, but not allow the dealers in this state to sell those will vehicles on Sunday. As a consumer issue, it is a fact that Sunday is the largest shopping day for the second or third largest purchase that a family makes. I feel that enterprise system should free not have government controls setting forth the hours nor the days when the individual entrepreneur should be open for business. That is determined by the key that opens his or her business, by the investment that is provided and for the jobs that provided. The interest rates do not quit on Sunday. The overhead expenses don't stop on Sunday, and I don't that government has any business dictating the days that an independent business person can be open to the marketplace. It's rather amazing that you can buy, you can buy all other items with the exception of vehicles, cars, and recreational vehicles in this state on Sunday. I've been to shopping centers where there are car dealerships in that shopping center, where everything else is open, including the pornographic videos and the ... and the other items that are available that can be sold on Sunday. Yet. Ι think it's ridiculous that we do not allow car dealers to sell cars on Sunday to the detriment of not only those dealers, those employees, but also to the consumers of this state.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

If, in fact, I've ever seen a Bill that says 'government stay on my back', it's this Amen... this statute that says to business people you cannot stay open. I no virtually no other area where this statute mandates the opening days for the private enterprise system. If you believe that we should have a private enterprise system, I ask that you vote 'yes' on Amendment #3 to !!!! and allow car dealers to operate just like any other business in this state, as they so desire, and open seven days a week, if necessary. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Yes, Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? I'm sorry. To explain your vote."

Johnson: "For the purpose of asking Members to vote Nobody in here really believes that requiring consciences. car dealers to be closed on Sunday is a good idea. Nobody really believes that. I realize we've got lobbying forces and we've got other factors that enter into this. But, for God's sake, if we're ever going to have any kind of adherence to a free enterprise system, what could be more reasonable than allowing an individual business to decide when there's no threat to public health or own, safety or welfare in any regard, to decide when they to open and when they want they don't .... when they don't want to open. This is just an eminently reasonable Amendment, and I just urge you to look at at what Representative Mautino is trying to do and look at what's right and wrong and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Marshall, Ms. Koehler, one minute to explain your vote."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment for two reasons and to explain why. Number one, we are in the retailing business, and to me it is ludicrous that we in the General Assembly would be dictating to individual retailers what hours they would be able to... to sell during the week and particularly to close them for one day a week. And, second of all, this is a restraint of business and a restraint of job creation. At a time when we are trying to encourage business in Illinois, this is definitely going in the wrong direction, to be closing our automobile dealers on Sunday. I rise in support of Mr. Mautino's Amendment and hope you will join us in adopting it."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a great Republican business issue sponsored by a Democrat. Every Republican on this side ought to be supporting Mautino. I rise in support of and I think we ought to have the sufficient number of 'aye' votes up there."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vitek, for what purpose do you seek recognition? I believe you spoke in debate."
- Vitek: "Yeah, but when Tim Johnson says he don't believe anybody in the House here really believes that they should be closed on Sunday, I get up and says I do. Now, in answer to that, it isn't because I voted for... against this last time and before and before and before, but the thousands of letters that I got from the people that work for these dealers. They're glad to be home with their families on Sunday, and it's the first chance they've had to do it. And I'm a family man."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, one minute to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

explain your vote."

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative John Vitek just stole my speech. I was going to get up and remind the Membership that it was the Dealer Association that requested this legislation a few years ago. Now, if they want to change it, I'm trying to go along with them. I wish they would make up their minds."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Lake, Ms. Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Mr. Vitek is right.

We did get a great deal of mail, and we got very many phone
calls from the men and women who sell cars and their
families. But they are organized and well orchestrated. I
think the people we did not hear from are the very many
thousands of consumers who would like to be able to shop
when they are available and would like to be able to bring
their families in to have input to what is, afterall, a
family decision. I urge an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Klemm, one minute to explain your vote."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Klemm: House, last time this issue came up, I agreed, and I still agree that the lack of courage of automobile dealers to close their own facilities on Sunday is their business, and I shame them for not doing it. I voted against closing them on Sunday to keep the business open. But, you know, I went on the television. I've been on radio. I sent newsletter about it, and I have only received, I think, three consumers' letters saying that they were sorry closed them on Sunday. For the most part, nobody even I haven't gotten any measurable complaints about cared. closing on Sunday. So, that's the reason I am now changing my vote, voting against this so that we would end up allowing them now to close on Sunday, because the consumers didn't seem to be concerned enough to even write."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Braun, one minute to explain your vote."

- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just point out how schizophrenic this General Assembly seems to be on the issue of enterprise. There seems to be some instances in which free enterprise makes sense. and there are other instances in which free enterprise doesn't make sense. If a businessman wants to close his or her business, then that person entitled to do so if this Amendment were to be adopted. Unfortunately, it doesn't appear that it will. And again, we've taken a dual position on whether or not we're for free choice or not in the marketplace."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all... Mr. DeJaegher, one minute to explain your vote."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hopefully that all of you will look at that board and vote your conscience in this particular matter. We, as Legislators, I don't believe, were sent down here for the purpose of legislating against the free enterprise system. Basically, this is what we're doing. We're legislating against the free enterprise system. We're taking the rights of people away that has been established for a good number of years. I think that you should reassess this and vote positive for it. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 50 voting 'aye', 63 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'.

  Yes, Mr. Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Mautino: "I was going to seek verification of the 'no' votes if, in fact, that is the final Roll. I wouldn't normally do this, but..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman is within his rights. So there are

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

50 voting 'aye', 63 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. Mr. Mautino, the Gentleman from Bureau, requests a Verification of the Negative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, proceed to verify the Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the negative. Barger. Barnes. Berrios. Breslin. Capparelli. Christensen. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Cullerton. Curran. Daniels. Davis. DeLeo. Deuchler. Parley. Virginia Prederick. Dwight Friedrich. Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth. Hallock. Hensel. Hartke. Hastert. Hicks. Hoffman. Keane. Klemm. Kubik. Kulas. Laurino. Leflore. Leverenz. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McMaster. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahey. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Bernard Pedersen. William Peterson. Pangle. Piel. Regan. Ronan. Ropp. Ryder. Shaw. Steczo. Terzich. Vinson. Vitek. Weaver. White. Williamson. And Wojcik. No further."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino, questions of the Negative Roll Call."

Mautino: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio. Mr. Giglio in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Giglio from the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Representative Berrios."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Berrios is in his chair."

Mautino: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman in the chamber. How is Mr. Hoffman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Hoffman from the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Mr. Countryman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Countryman. Mr. Countryman in the chamber?

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

How is Mr. Countryman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting ... "

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Countryman has returned to the chamber.

Mr. Hoffman has returned to the chamber. Return Mr. Hoffman to the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Mr. McNamara."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman... excuse me. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Stange, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stange: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How am I voted?"

Speaker Greiman: "You are voted as 'aye'."

Stange: "Change me to 'no', please."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Stange goes from 'aye' to 'no'. Excuse me.

Mr... Ms. Plowers, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Greiman: "You're recorded as voting 'present'."

Flowers: "Would you please change my vote to 'aye'?"

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Flowers goes from 'present' to 'aye'. Yes,
Mr. Bullock, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr.
Bullock goes from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Hastert. Mr. Hastert
goes... Yes, for what purpose... Oh, Mr. Hastert and Mr.
Davis ask leave to be verified. Do they have leave, Mr.
Mautino? They do. Yes. Mr. Friedrich asks leave to be
verified. Proceed, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio has returned to the chamber.

Restore Mr. Giglio to the Roll Call. Mr. Giglio, would
you come to the podium? Mr. Mautino, proceed."

Mautino: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel is in his chair checking Amendments."

Mautino: "Representative Pangle."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pangle. Mr. Pangle is at the side."

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Mautino: "Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?"

Mautino: "O'Connell."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. O'Connell. How is Mr. O'Connell recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. O'Connell from the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Representative McNamara. I don't know if I called him before."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McNamara is in his chair."

Mautino: "I can see I can't get 13 off of there, Mr. Speaker.

I'll withdraw the...."

- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you very much. On this question there are 49 voting 'aye', 64 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Koehler, amends Senate Bill
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Marshall, Ms. Koehler, on Amendment #4."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1111 would allow car dealers to be open six Sundays a year upon filing a letter of intent with the Secretary of State's Office..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Koehler, excuse me. I am advised that this has not been printed and distributed. Mr. Mays, Gentleman from Adams."
- Mays: "I believe that the topic matter that would be addressed in that Amendment is similar to that that we just addressed, not to my satisfaction, but that's the way it worked out. I would like to move this Bill on to Third Reading. It's a typical, finely-crafted Bill, jointly sponsored by Chairman Ronan and myself that drives for consensus. And I don't know that the adoption of an Amendment similar to the one that was just defeated 49-64 would go toward that goal."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Is that... somewhere in that, Mr. Mays, is that a Motion to table or just..."

Mays: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "... free..."

Mays: "In nicely..."

Speaker Greiman: "I see. Alright."

Mays: "Nicely done"

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Koehler, do you wish to withdraw the Amendment?"

Koehler: "Reluctantly."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Koehler: "Reluctantly withdraw."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further
Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills
Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1125.
Ms. Braun, do you wish to proceed with that Bill. Mr.
Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Hospital District Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, McMaster - Homer, amends Senate
Bill 1125."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, on Amendment #1."

McMaster: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Currently, there are conflicting opinions as to who can and cannot serve on a hospital board, board of directors of a hospital. Actually, under an informal opinion of the Attorney General, there's a question whether, for instance, a member of a board of directors of a bank can serve on the hospital

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

board. I think that it is difficult enough to get public-spirited citizens who are willing to serve on boards such as this, and the purpose of this Amendment is to clarify that and make it possible for some of our better citizens, for instance, bank board members, to serve on a board of a hospital. I do not know of any opposition to this Amendment. I understand the Sponsor of the Bill is not in opposition to it, and I would urge its adoption."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox moves for the adoption of Amendment #! to Senate Bill 1125. And on that, is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Amendment. As I understand, it will address a problem in some smaller localities throughout the state where they need to have the talent serve on these respective boards. And so I encourage your adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Purther Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Very briefly, Representative Cullerton, in the Chair."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and now I'm the Speaker. As you know, Representative Vinson and I have the distinction of being the two resident comedian politicians. I think Vinson's funnier than I am, but that's just a little modesty on my part. We do have with us today a former candidate for President of the United States, and I thought I'd introduce him to you, Pat Paulson."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Pat Paulson: "I'm very excited to be here. Land of Lincoln. I'm here to get a wax museum made for myself, anybody wants to get involved in that. Basically, I'm starting the campaign for '88, looking for a few fat cats like to get in on it, a couple hundred thousand from several of you will qet So, if you want to talk to me after, that would be I will be running in Iowa. Basically, I'll go there and caucus. I'll probably caucus all over Iowa, I don\*t know. Maybe in DeMoines twice. I have no idea. Somebody asked me, 'Are you running as a Republican or a Democrat?' Well, I'll tell you the difference between a Republican and The average Democrat belongs to the Lion's Democrat. Club and the average Republican belongs to the country Now. there's а connection hetween these organizations. The drainage system from the country club is the water supply for the Lion's Club. I don't want to take anymore of your time. I'm actually in town here working so I'd like to see a lot of you come down to the Mason Street Comedy Addition. I'll show you how to really control a crowd. We'll see you there, I hope. appreciate it."

Speaker Greiman: "On Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1153. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1153, a Bill for an Act relating to the supply and distribution of water. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1159.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1159, a Bill for an Act relating to the duty of public institutions of higher education. Second

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1174. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Brunsvold, do you wish to proceed with that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1174, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Brunsvold, amends Senate Bill 1174."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold, on Amendment #1."
- Brunsvold: "Hello? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to
  11... Senate Bill 1174 would simply address the retired
  teachers and it simply says they may, if the school board
  agrees and they feel it is more convenient, for them to
  make payment for their insurance benefits under their
  retired plan directly to the retirement system. And that's
  all it does. It says they may do it, and I would ask for
  the adoption of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Rock Island moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1174. Is there any discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Joel, what change does this make in the law? Does this... my analysis indicates that this requires the school boards to make the premium payments. Is that not correct?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Brunsvold: "Right now, they are to make the premium payment. But
  this Amendment simply says, if the school board and the
  retired teacher agrees it would be more convenient, more
  expeditious for them to make the payment directly to the
  retirement system for their insurance, then they may do
  that, if it's better for both of them to do it."
- McCracken: "I see. Okay. So it's no cost change. Done by agreement only."
- Brunsvold: "No. It may, in fact, be more advantageous in some situations to do this."
- McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment | be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills
  Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1189.
  Mr. Kubik. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate
  Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill
  1210. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1210, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are none."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate, appears Senate Bill 1245.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to regional port districts. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #12"
- Clerk Leone: "A Motion to table. 'I move to table Amendment #1

  to Senate Bill 1245', signed by Representative Van Duyne."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this out of the record temporarily with leave to come back to the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Senate Bill 1245, out of the record.

  Representative Giglio, in the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. On the Order of Second Reading Short

  Debate appears Senate Bill 1248. Mr. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1248, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to forest preserve districts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 1248 on page one and so forth."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My understanding is that this is a restructuring language of the original Bill for clarification purposes and that there's no change in the effect. And I would move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you. Would the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman indicates he will."
- Cullerton: "Representative Hoffman, I know it is just a technical
  Amendment to redraft the original Bill. I wondered if you
  could just tell me what the need for the original Bill is
  or was."
- Hoffman: "My understanding is, and it is the Forest Preserve Act,

  is ... clarification of the law in reference to a Public

  Act that was passed subsequent to that."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Cullerton: "Well, it has something to do with raising interest rates on bonds for forest preserve districts, and I just wondered if there was some problem that Senator Pawell found in her county dealing with forest preserves where they tried to float some bonds or something and they couldn't pass it or..."

Hoffman: "I'm sorry, Representative. All I know is that the Public Act..."

Cullerton: "I'll tell you what we'll do. This is on Second Reading. I have no objection to the Amendment. If you could check with the staff and Senator Fawell, if you are still talking to her, and find out on Third Reading what the background is, I'd appreciate it, and I'll just ask you that on Third Reading."

Hoffman: "Certainly."

Cullerton: "Thank you. No further questions."

Speaker Giglio: "No further questions. Representative Hoffman, to close."

Hoffman: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1248. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. In the opinion of the Chair, the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On the Order of Second Reading

Short Debate appears Senate Bill 1285, Representative

Hawkinson. Representative Hawkinson, on... Yes,

Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "We just skipped House Bill...Senate Bill 1284... 1264."

Speaker Giglio: "The next Bill was 1245... or 1249,

Representative. That was..."

Hallock: "Right. We did 1249 and 1249. Now, the next Bill is

- 58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

  1264, and we'd like to call that Bill, please."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. I'm sorry. We didn't do 1249. The next Bill then on the Calendar is 1264, Representative Hallock. Representative Piel."
- Piel: "The last Bill we did was 1248. The next Bill on Order is 1249. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Well, that's just my mistake. I understand the Gentleman didn't want to have it called."
- Piel: "Okay."
- Speaker Giglio: "Is that alright, Representative Piel?"
- Piel: "I guess the Amendments aren't ready to go. So we'll pass
  over that."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. In that Order appears House Bill 1264,

  Representative Hallock... Senate Bill 1264."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1264, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning certain funds of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Hallock, amends Senate Bill 1264 as amended."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hallock, on Amendment #1."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

  Amendment #1 amends the statute by providing that the
  Tourism Convention Bureau, which we established last year,
  the current funding for them will be for those programs
  which already exist now and for those which were
  established by January 1st of 1985. And I would ask for
  your support."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate
  Bill 1264. Any discussion? No discussion. All those in
  favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the
  opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1285, Representative Hawkinson. Senate Bill 1285."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1295, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning missing children. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "No Amendments. Third Reading. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1288, Representative Williamson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1288, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the report of child abuse and neglect. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "No Ploor Amendments. Third Reading. Senate
Bill 1294, Representative Olson. Mr. Clerk, read the
Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1294, a Bill for an Act in relationship to medical, health, vision, pharmaceutical and dental services plans. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Olson, amends Senate Bill

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson, on Amendment #1."

Olson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a fee Bill. Amendment #1 is an addition to the fee Bill which simply raises the filing fees which have been set in place since about 1961, would raise an additional 250,000 dollars. It does not, and I

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

would repeat, it does not include any assessments. Examination fees would continue to go to the General Revenue Fund. And we feel that this Bill is meritorious. With the Amendment, we would raise some additional monies by filing fees which would go to the GRF which would give us control. And I would urge adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves adoption #1 to Senate Bill 1294.

Any discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Olson, if you could have the staff
person for the Insurance Committee check this Amendment
out, I think you may find that the Vision Service Plan Act
is left..."

Olson: "What page?"

Cullerton: "What page? I think throughout the entire Act..."

Olson: "Oh, you mean the descript..."

Cullerton: "Yeah. The Vision Service Plan Act is... the provisions of the original Bill are left in tact with respect to that Act and there's no reference to Section 408, as done with the other service plan Acts. So, if you want to adopt the Amendment and move it to Third, that fine, but I think it might be... there might be a technical problem with it. And I just want to make you aware of it."

Olson: "We will, and I shall call it to their attention."

Speaker Giglio: "Any further discussion? Representative Olson, on Amendment #1, to close."

Olson: "I just move for adoption."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves for adoption of #1 to Senate
Amendment... 1 to Senate Bill 1294. All those in favor
signify by saying 'aye', all those ... Representative...
excuse me. Hartke, do you wish to speak?"

Hartke: "Yes, I'd like to ... Would the Sponsor yield?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hartke: "Representative Olson, isn't this the same... in this

Amendment, isn't this the same Bill that we defeated a

couple of weeks ago, House Bill 2438?"

Olson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "This is the same principle of the Bill that was defeated at 10:15 on Friday, May 24th when about 25 or 30 Members were off the floor. I'm sorry to say, Representative Hartke, in response to your inquiry, that the opponents of this measure have misrepresented its contents. The insurance industry has not taken a position on this companies have. And they have continually misrepresented what the Bill offered and what is saying. This is not the same Bill that was under much discussion here, with the Speaker of the in the summer of 1984. This is merely an additional raise in filing fees dedicated to the General Revenue Fund which gives us control over the use. So. I answered your question rather lengthy, but that is correct. It is the same Bill. The Amendment has been slightly redrafted to hopefully reach the objections of the person who representations to you."

Olson: "That's correct."

Hartke: "Okay. You said it would raise additional monies. How much additional monies..."

Olson: "250,000 dollars in filing fees."

Hartke: "250,000 dollars in filing fees."

Olson: "Correct."

Hartke: "Who pays those filing fees?"

Olson: "They're paid by the insurance companies who do business

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

here."

Hartke: "In the State of Illinois."

Olson: "Correct."

Hartke: "In addition to what they're paying now."

"That's correct. We've had the same fee schedule Olson: effect here, Representative Hartke, for about 24 years. I just want to emphasize to the Membership we are not talking about the same issue that was raised and in which we had lengthy discussions a year ago. This is merely a filing fee increment for the people who do business in this state. And we feel very strongly about them picking up the tab. as opposed to not having those funds. When and if some companies go down in the GRF, this General Assembly has to support them. We've had some insurance failures in the state in the last couple of years. We're the fifth largest writer of insurance in the nation... I think this is a reasonable case for the industry to pay its own way."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Shaw: "Representative Olson, this Amendment is the same as was
House Bill 2438 that was defeated. Is that right?"

Olson: "The Amendment has been slightly redrafted at the top of page 15 to meet the objections of your representation from your industry, Representative, and contains, Representative Shaw, the same elements."

Shaw: "In the bottom line... Well, the bottom line is you're still transferring the money from the General Revenue Fund... What are you doing now?"

Olson: "It goes..."

Shaw: "I just got the Amendment."

Olson: "Alright. It does not include any assessments, and the examination fees would still go to, not away from, the

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

General Revenue Fund. We would still be the movers and shakers as to the expenditures. What we are doing is increasing the revenue of the Department. We are not assessing anybody. It's not an assessment program. It's a dedicated fund, and this money is strictly controlled in the General Revenue."

- Shaw: "But really what you want to do in this fund is give the absolute control to the Department of Insurance. Is that right?"
- Olson: "The Department of Insurance has always had control with regard to the assessment of filing fees."
- Shaw: "But I understand... I understand that. But you don't want it.... In other words, the Legislature... the Legislature wouldn't have any say on how this money basically is spent, because you would always have this in the reserves. The Department of Insurance would always have this as a reserve in it's budget, even though they could come to the Legislature for an appropriation in addition to the guaranteed funds that we're now talking about. Is that right?"
- Olson: "All we're doing, Representative Shaw, is enhancing the filing fee revenue 250,000 dollars, a small fraction of the total budget of the Department of Insurance. This... Go ahead."
- Shaw: "Yeah, but... Yeah, but this fee does not... it's a little bit more than 250,000 dollars. This guaranteed fund is something like... you're talking about millions of dollars here, aren't you?"
- Olson: "No. We're not talking... We're not talking about the guarantee fund which was an issue last year. That's why I think you are getting bad advise from the people who are suggesting to you that you contest this Bill."
- Shaw: "Well, one final question to you. Why would you want to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

tamper with this fund, and this fund has been working fine in the past, why would you want to tamper with it at this time?"

Olson: "We're not tampering. We're looking for additional ways
to enhance the revenue of the Department of Insurance and
that revenue to come from the people who do business here.
We're not tampering with anything."

"Okay. To the Bill... To the Amendment. This is the same Shaw: Amendment that was on House Bill 2438. Now, this fund has been around for quite a number of years, and it has worked But now Representative Olson would lead the Members fine. of this General Assembly to believe that they're going to make it work better. This is money that is deposited there by the insurance companies, and the Department of Insurance money. No one is objecting to that. They have been using the money all the time; but, at the same at this time, Representative Olson has introduced an Amendment to take control... to remove control basically from the Legislative Branch and transfer it over to the Department of Insurance. If it's going Department of Revenue, if it's going to the General Revenue Fund, why does he introduce this Amendment? Why should he introduce this Amendment? Why should he tamper with this fund? But it's a ... through probably no intent of his, he probably has gotten bad advise, but this is a sneaky way to get control of the fund that has worked perfectly in the And now they want to take control of this fund give it to the Department of Insurance and let Department of Insurance do more or less what it wants to this fund. I don't think it's right. with I don't think I think this Amendment should it should happen. defeated. And untilRepresentative Olson explains to the people of this... to this Body adequately why he want to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

tamper with this money and it's been working fine in the past, we should defeat this Amendment. And I ask for a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson, to close."

Olson: "Thank you very much. I'll just reiterate the issues that I described just to make it perfectly clear. We are not tampering with the fund. We are enhancing the filing fees. It does not include any assessments. The General Assembly still has control over appropriations. You can't do much better than that. I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment to this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1294. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Shaw, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shaw: "I was asking for a Roll Call... tring to get your attention for a Roll Call vote, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like a question by the Parliamentarian. Does this change ... of the Parliamentarian, rather. Does this change the title of the Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "Would you repeat the question, Representative Shaw?"

Shaw: "Does the Amendment change the title of the Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"

Piel: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman's request is really not timely. The Bill has already been moved to Third Reading, and if that request would be made, that request would be made on Second Beading."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman... The Gentleman's inquiry of the Chair is whether or not the Amendment changes the title of the Bill. The Parliamentarian informed me it does. The Bill, however, has been moved to Third Reading. Alright, Representative Shaw. We're going to check the tape and see what the status of the Bill is. Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Leverenz: "I just wanted to make sure my light was working, because I wanted to ask a question, and then I wanted to get a Roll Call vote, and none of that happened. Maybe you can remove the piece of paper you have off the top of the podium."
- Speaker Giglio: "Yeah, we're checking the machine also. We're going to check the tapes. On the Order of Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1296. Representative Tate? Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1296, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
  Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

- Speaker Giglio: "No Floor Amendments. Third Reading. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1335. Representative Stern?

  Out of the Record. On the Order of Second Reading on page 20 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1345, Representative Curran. Representative Curran in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Curran, amends Senate Bill 1345."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Curran on Amendment #1."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Amendment #1 simply changes the effective date, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1345. Is there any discussion? No discussion.

  All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1345 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On the Order of Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1357. Representative Ronan.

  Representative Ronan in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1357, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Hawkinson, amends Senate Bill 1357."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hoffman on Amendment #1.

  Hawkinson, excuse me. Representative Hawkinson on

  Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1357."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1357. All those in favor say 'aye'.
  'Aye?' 'Nays?' The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. On the Calendar on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1396.

  Representative McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1396, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On the Calendar appears Senate
Bill 1398, Representative Terzich. Senate Bill 1398,
Representative Terzich. Do you have... Mr. Clerk, read the
Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1398, a Bill for an Act to revise various Acts to resolve multiple amendments or additions, corrections, technical errors and other patent errors and omissions, to revise cross-references and to delete obsolete and duplicative provisions. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Ronan, do you seek recognition?"

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. How's your vision today?"

Speaker Giglio: "We're rolling."

Ronan: "Yeah. What... What happened to House Bill 1394... Senate Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "1394, I understand they're working on some Amendments, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Well... And I agree to those Amendments. Let's move it to Third Reading, and I'll call it back when the time comes."

Speaker Giglio: "I will get back to it, Representative Ronan.

Alright. On Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1394,

Representative Ronan. Are you ready to discuss 1394? Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1394, a Bill for an Act to amend the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Religious and Charitable Risk Pooling Trust Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "No Amendments. Third Reading. You're welcome.

On Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1412, Representative

Terzich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1412, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Enterprise Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed and there are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. We're going to return to some Bills on Second Reading that were not called, so we have...
We're going to go in order, here, by number. On the list appears Senate Bill 210. Mr. Clerk? Let's see.
Representative Preston, on Senate Bill 210. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 210, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On the Calendar appears... on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 406 on page 15.

Representative Soliz, on page 15 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 406. Representative Soliz? Brookins? Representative Brookins on Senate Bill 406? Page 15 of the Calendar."

Brookins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of..."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 406, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Washington - Soliz - Brookins Levin, amends Senate Bill 406 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Brookins on Amendment #2."

Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would prevent them from charging... late charge... charging a fee for late charges on estimated bills. That is, when the bill... your meter is read, it's a estimated bill. This would prevent them from charging you a late charge."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Could the Gentleman explain exactly what the Amendment does one more time?"

Brookins: "Repeat, Mr. Piel. I didn't understand what you're asking."

Piel: "Could you... I'm sorry. I just got on the floor. Could you explain what this Amendment does one more time, please?"

Brookins: "If the utilities does not come to your house and read the meter, which they don't do... They send an estimated bill. They estimate what the amount of electricity, gas, so forth, you have used. Then, they will charge you a late charge because you don't pay on the estimated bill when they estimate it one time. This Bill will prevent them from charging you that late charge."

Piel: "Is this... Correct me if I'm wrong. Isn't this similar to a Bill that we defeated in Committee?"

Brookins: "It's similar to Senate Bill 406.

Piel: "No, no, no. Senate Bill 406 is what you're putting..."

Brookins: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry. It's similar to Bill 470.

470."

Piel: "470. What happened to 470?"

Brookins: "I think that it was... I'm sorry. I can't answer

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

that, and the staffer isn't here yet."

Piel: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Brookins: "It was a Jerry Washington Bill. It was my seat mate's
Bill, and I think it most likely wasn't called, or
something, but it didn't come out of the Committee."

Piel: "That was... That Bill - correct me if I'm wrong - but that
Bill on the House floor..."

Brookins: "Mr. Piel, let me yield to Bllis Levin, who can give you the answer to that."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is identical to House Bill 470, which was reported out of our Committee and passed the House by a 76 to 40 vote."

Piel: "The... Have you got any idea on the cost of... Obviously, if you have to start hiring extra, you know, meter readers and everything, each utility, and especially if we were sitting here talking about a heavy metropolitan area like the City of Chicago. And, you know, they have to start hiring extra meter readers and everything. What is the potential cost to the consumers, on this?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Brookins?"

Brookins: "Hello. Yes, Mr. Piel, it's the obligation of a businessman to be in the position to do business. Now, the utility companies should be no different. They should be in the position to do business, and if it calls for having employees to read meters, as they say that they are supposed to read meters, then they should be there to read the meters. It is not the obligation of... of a citizen to take on their backs that of a utility, so, therefore, if they need extra employees, hire extra employees."

Piel: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative McCracken?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

McCracken: "Thank you. Is... We addressed this issue once before, did we not, Representative Brookins?"

Brookins: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. And it's the current law that estimated billings cannot be conducted more than for a 60 day period.

Is that it? That you have to have an actual reading at least every other month?"

Brookins: "I'm not quite sure. I know there's some stipulation,
but I could not answer in the affirmative."

McCracken: "Okav. Well, let me address the Amendment, then. The late payment can accumulate for a period not greater 30 days because I believe the current law is that you cannot estimate payments more than once; that every other payment has to be based on an actual reading. Now if, in fact, that's the law, either pursuant to statute or rule, then all we have the potential for is the 30 If the 30 day accumulation does not carry accumulation. with it an interest charge, two things happen. One, is no incentive to pay on a 30 day basis; and two, the company loses the use of that money on a 30 dav I understand that there is some problem where the company may not be complying with the current law where, in fact, they're estimating billings for periods greater than 30 or 60 days. But that is not the problem that this Bill What this Bill seeks to do is change the law so addresses. that there can be no late charges on estimated billings. better practice is to enforce the law that's currently written; and, if it takes an administrative order or if it takes the ICC to come down on Commonwealth Edison and say, 'You bill estimated basis on a 30 day period only', then do it that way. Go to JCAR. Tell them to issue an order. Let's get it done. I'm all for enforcing the 30 or 60 day rule, but to prohibit a penalty charge for any late payment

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

of estimated billing goes far too far, and I must oppose this Amendment, but I certainly support the concept that they can estimate billing only once or; that is, that they can estimate billing not twice in a row or greater. So, let's enforce the rule or law we've got now. That's enough. I stand in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Representative Brookins, does this just apply to electric bills, or does it also... to gas?"

Brookins: "Utilities. Utilities - gas."

Terzich: "Well, you know, if people are making payments on estimated, you know, whether they're... time payments or anything of that nature, these are estimated bills. I mean, they pay bills, and if they don't pay these bills, they also get charged late payments, don't they? Penalties or late payment penalties? Such as if you were making a car payment or any other type of a payment which is an estimated payment, and if you didn't pay it on time, you would... there would be late payment charges, wouldn't there?"

Brookins: "No. No. That is not a estimated bill. You know at the beginning of the month that your car note is \$230 and is due the 30th of the month. So, on the 30th of the month, they give you five days grace. If you don't pay it, you've got a late charge on it. That's understandable."

Terzich: "Well... Well, do... "

Brookins: "But the situation we're talking about, Terzich, is that I come to your... I don't come to tell you how much the bill is going to be. I exaggerate the bill. I put down any amount that I want to put down, and then I charge you for not paying it on time."

Terzich: "Alright. Isn't there a lot of consumers that want estimated bills? Don't they... Don't they have some type

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

of a budget plan?"

Brookins: "No, they don't want estimated... In that instance, here again, this is estimated over a year, so you know prior to paying, how much is due, and you pay."

Terzich: "Well, that would be similar to an estimated bill also,
wouldn't it? Don't they make adjustments on estimated
bills?"

Brookins: "At the end of the year."

Terzich: "Right."

Brookins: "At the end of the year, they make an adjustment. But in our case, they charge you the interest on the estimated bill which you do not know is going to come to you. You don't know how much it's going to be."

Terzich: "Would they have to... In a lot of these estimated bills also, though, what happens if the people aren't home to read their meters?"

Brookins: "I think you and I both know, in the City of Chicago and in the rural areas, that these are on the outside of the house. You just walk up and read them and keep on going. And, as was brought out by a learned opponent on the other side, they don't even bother to come to read them anymore. They just send you estimated, one after another after another, and keep doubling the interest on you, and late charges."

Terzich: "Well, what does the utility state on that the... No,

I've heard statements contrary to the fact that, you know,
in addition of what you're saying, then they should
increase their number of meter readers or what have you,
quite substantially, which would also be passed onto the
consumer, wouldn't it?"

Brookins: "Well, I'm a businessman, as you know, Terzich, and if

I can't do the job, then I'll close my business. If I

can't have the number of employees to operate a business

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

effectively and as it should be, then I close the business. And I'm saying to you, if the utility companies can't operate their business, if they can't afford to hire employees, then close their business."

Terzich: "You know, I know that your business is dying, anyhow,

Representative Brookins, and that should be the case with
this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I'm appalled at some of the questions that are being asked about this estimated bill business. We passed a Bill out here a few weeks ago, the same type of left out of this House with an overwhelming Majority, and everybody know that ... who live in Chicago, companies, particularly the gas company, will not come out and read your meter. The light company similar. but the gas company have a machine gun on the people of Chicago and the people of this state in terms of estimated bill reading. You know and I know that there's no way that you should be charged for a estimated bill. They sit right here in Peoria and, by computer, estimate the people's gas bill here in Springfield and charge you accordingly by information that's fed into that computer. Now, the gas company will tell you that they are not... that that's not accurate, but at the same you've still paid your money on that estimated bill, if you're late. This affects senior citizens, poor people and working people all across this state, and in Chicago, they do it just like eating lunch. Last year, they collected some \$36,000,000 in late charges. There is no way that the utility companies should be allowed to collect \$36,000,000 late charges on estimated bills, but the record themselves, if you call the Illinois Commerce Commission,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

this... these are their figures, that \$36,000,000 they... was collected last year from late charges on estimated That is ridiculous. In no other industry in this bills. state or in this country is this allowed to happen. want to allow the big utility company to suppress POOL people by just going into their pocket, taking their money right out of their pocket. This is a issue that's not hard to understand. You... If you've got a car Representative Brookins said, you know what your payment is going to be, and it's a legitimate payment, but here we are guessing about how much your bill is, and we're going to charge you 1.5 percent of that late... of that bill for late charges. Not only that, you charge an accrued... the utility companies charge an accrued interest on That is ridiculous. It's stupid for the FCC and this Body to allow that to happen in this state, and this Amendment should go on, and the utility companies should be... should be run out of this state if it's allowed to continue."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request a Roll Call, and if appropriate, to move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin, do you seek recognition?

Representative Levin? Do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Levin: "Yes, I had turned my light on in order to request to speak."

Speaker Giglio: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Levin: "I was, you know, seeking recognition to speak."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Levin: "I rise in support of this Amendment. This Amendment, as

I indicated in response to a question, is identical to

House Bill 470, which we passed out of this Body by a 76 to

40 vote. We have a problem in certain parts of the city

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

and in certain parts of the state where they re not... the utilities are not meeting their obliqations in terms of reading the meters every couple of months. They may go a whole year or two years or three years without reading a and the bills that they send their customers in those circumstances are totally inaccurate and are totally out of line with the amount of gas and electricity actually being used. It seems to me this is a fundamentally fair Amendment. It's one that we passed out of this Body once would hope that we could adopt already, and I this Amendment and then, you know, pass this Bill out of the House again."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Brookins, to close."

Brookins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Number one, if the utilities was doing their job, there would be no need for this Amendment. Number two, the meter readers just decide that they're not going to read somebody's meter because they don't feel like going over there, or they don't want to go over there, so they don't go over there, and you get an estimated bill. Number three, the folks that can least afford it are the ones that are hit the hardest by it. Those points was brought out.

I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 406. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Alright. On the Order of Second

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Reading on page 16... Representative Shaw, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Shaw: "Yes, did we get an answer on that... on 12... "

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw, pertaining to your inquiry, the question was referred, and the tapes were heard, and the Bill has been moved to Third Reading. Senate Bill 1294 has been moved to Third Reading, Sir. For what purpose do you rise, Sir? Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Yes, Representative Hartke and I request to go up and listen to the tape."

Speaker Giglio: "Pardon, Sir?"

Shaw: "Representative Hartke and I request to go up and listen to the tape."

Speaker Giglio: "Oh, I'm sure that privilege could be granted.
We'll contact the Chief Clerk."

Shaw: "Mr... Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Shaw: "I also move... I right now move that it go to Second Reading First Legislative Day. Right now."

Speaker Giglio: "The request is out of order... Representative Shaw. It's too late. Representative Shaw, contact the Clerk's Office, and I'm sure Mr. O'Brien will accommodate you and Representative Hartke. On Second Reading appears Senate Bill 499, Representative.. Representative Nash. Mr. Clerk. read the Bill. Representative Representative Levin handled your Bill, and it was moved to Third Reading. On Second Reading appears Senate Bill... We have a few more Bills we're going to go over, and then we're going to go on the Special Order of Business. On the Order of Second Reading on page 17 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 755. Representative Preston? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 755, a Bill for an Act to amend the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Illinois Vehicle Code. It's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #2, Preston, amends Senate Bill 755."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston on Amendment #2."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 amends Senator Degnan's Bill to put in the same requirements and licensing requirements by the state regional superintendents of education for day care facility bus drivers that currently apply to school bus drivers, and it requires day care facility bus drivers to obtain permits from the regional superintendents of education similar to what now is required of school bus drivers. And I'd ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "This is the best idea this Sponsor has had all

Session. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question or two, please."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "What types of requirements would these drivers have to meet, under this Bill, specifically?"

Preston: "Well, it's a... There are a variety of requirements.

I'll just go through some of them that are in existing law and in the Bill. They'd have to be 21 years of age or older. They'd have to, of course, possess a driver's license. They have to have had no revocation or suspension in the previous three year period. They have to be determined to be physically fit as determined by a doctor, the same as school bus drivers are today. They have to have some knowledge of first aid and drivers safety. They have to have had no convictions in the previous year for

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

reckless driving, driving under the influence, manslaughter or reckless driving. They must not have been convicted of murder, sexual assault. They must not have been convicted of a felony. They must not have caused death through the unlawful operation of an auto... automobile, and free of any mental disorder or disabilitating (sic - debilitating) type disease."

Pullen: "How is it determined whether they're free of any mental disorder?"

Preston: "They... First of all, they're asked if they've ever been treated for a disorder, and if they have, they explain the nature of it, but basically, they have to have had... What it really amounts to is a physical exam. They have to provide a physical examination from a... from their physician, and the questions that the physician answers in conducting that physical is sufficient."

Pullen: "Would this include drivers of, for example, a special education bus where the special education district itself doesn't run the bus but contracts for bus service?"

Preston: "I don't believe this Amendment affects that at all. In fact, I know this Amendment does not. That is already covered under existing law right now, and under the Bill as passed by the Senate, Senator Degnan's Bill, that Bill requires these criteria to be met of school bus drivers. And I... I would imagine, in the Bill, as... If the people you're talking about are school bus drivers, it would apply to them, but that's not the subject matter of my Amendment. The Amendment only applies that same criteria to day care facility bus or pick-up drivers."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Mays: "Lee, we've had this topic in Committee several different times in several different forms. I just want to be sure I've got it square. This does not do anything with the mode of transportation — the bus — it doesn't mandate safety things on that at all. This just deals with the driver only. Is that correct?"

Preston: "That is correct."

Nays: "Okay. Now that we've got it narrowed to that, if I were to take my... several kids from my child's day care school to the zoo on a Saturday, would I have to be permitted under this thing?"

Preston: "Certainly not."

Mays: "Why not?"

Preston: "Because you're not doing it for profit, and you're not operating it as an employee of a day care facility or the contractor of a day care facility. So it would, of course, not apply to whatever an individual does on his or her free time."

Mays: "Where does it say not for profit, or those other qualifications that you put on there?"

Preston: "Well, you have to read the Amendment in light of the existing law, and Senator Degnan's Bill. And it is contained in there. I can't... I will be glad to point it out to you, you know, when we have an opportunity, but..."

Mays: "Well, the only point is, our staff would indicate that this Amendment, if adopted, would not... or, would require, in those cases, some volunteers taking the kids to the zoo or taking them to another event of some sort that they would have to be permitted under this Amendment. And with that question..."

Preston: "Representative Mays, this... our analysis indicates - and I'm quoting from it - at the bottom of the comment,

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

'The requirements contained in this Bill are nearly duplicative of requirements for obtaining a school bus driver permit for transporting school children, except it applies to child care facilities.' So... And that's the intent of the Bill, to make the existing law that applies to schools and school bus drivers apply to day care facility bus drivers."

Mays: "Only bus drivers at day care facilities?"

Preston: "Only bus drivers... bus or, you know, some... some use vans and some use cars, but if you're an employee or a contract... or have a contract with a day care facility to pick up children and to transport them to and from their homes and to or from the day care facility, you have to be certified to be a safe driver. That's all this requires."

Mays: "Well, I will not stand in opposition to this Amendment on the basis of your response. I would, however, like a follow-up before this moves on third."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston, to close."

Preston: "I think we've heard about the Bill. This simply requires school bus drivers to have the same safety requirements... day care facility bus drivers have the same safety requirements that school bus drivers are required to have and gives the Superintendent of Education the authority to issue those... those permits, and I'd ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 755. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. It's the intention of the Chair to go to the Order of Special Business after a few more

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Bills, and on the desk of each Member appears the Special Order of Business, and on the right hand side also appears the page number of each individual Bill. We are going to Agriculture right after these Bills. At 1:30, the intention is to go to the Special Order of Business on Elections. At 2:30, Economic Development, and at 3:30, State and Local Government. On the Order of Second Reading on page 17 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill... Excuse me. On page 18 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 965. Representative Olson? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 865, a Bill for an Act in relation to the conveyance of public lands. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Hastert."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1... Floor Amendment #1 to Bill 865 is a conveyance from the Department of Conservation of two very small parcels of land on each side of the Fox River. Ιt used to be the supports for a dam that was there in The Department has held on to that property. property is now used for a canoe portage, and the township, the local township park district maintains that portage, but the state has to pay the insurance on it. This is a conveyance of those two parcels to the township district with a reverter clause on it. That way the park district can pick up the insurance costs."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, Representative
Olson moves... Representative Olson, to close."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We accept the Amendment, and I would ask leave of the House to return this to the Consent

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Calendar from whence it was taken, to add this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "We'll adopt the Amendment. All those in favor on the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 865 signify by saying 'aye'. 'Nays'? In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson asks leave that Senate Bill 865 be returned to the Order of the Consent Calendar. Does he have leave? Third Reading, First Legislative Day. Representative Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I just wanted to indicate for the record that I have no opposition. I'm the one that filled out the slip."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton indicates he had no opposition to returning Senate Bills 865 to the Consent Calendar. Leave is granted. Next Bill is Senate Bill 1348. 1348, on page 20 of the Calendar. Representative Capparelli? Representative Capparelli? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the... of the Criminal Victims' Escrow Account
Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The... The hour of 12:30 having arrived, the House will now move to the Order of Special Business - Agriculture. Representative Davis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we did pass over Senate Bill 1245 on that Order of Call. I'm ready to go back to that, if you would delay this Third Reading call for just a few moments."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. We'll return to Senate Bill 1245
before we go on that Special Order. Senate Bill 1245 on
page 19 of the Calendar. Representative Davis. Mr.
Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act in relation to regional court districts and to amend certain Acts herein named. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Further Amendments? Motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1245,

by Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Davis has taken it upon himself in Committee to correct what considers a deficiency in the appointment procedures to members of, just specifically, the Joliet Port Authority. I have filed - and of course, the Amendment was adopted in Committee - and I have subsequently filed a tabling Motion to that... that Amendment, Amendment #1. No, I want to The analysis shows that Van clear something up. Duvne the Sponsor of the Amendment, and I have gone down to the well and found... and asked them to correct that, and Sponsor of the Amendment was Representative Davis, not Van Duyne. I am sponsoring the tabling Amendment. T · m in absolute opposition to the Amendment. First of all. Representative Davis did not ever consider speaking to me about this. He tried this same Amendment a couple of years ago, and we were successful in defeating it. Since that time, he has... hasn't come to me and talked to me, and by the way, the port district is comprised of five townships, two of which lie in my district, two of which lie in his district, and one that does not lie in either one of our districts. I just want to tell you that the people who are

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

on the port authority are absolutely opposed to this. They have made their wishes known on both sides of the aisle. The Governor's Office is being relieved by the amendment of appointments, and these appointments are transferred to the county board chairman, and then there are two new members being added to the board, one of which the county board chairman will have and one of which the will have, which gives the absolute mayor appointment and control of the port authority to chairman. The port authority, as I said. is absolutely opposed to this, and not only that, the Governor's Office, I have been told by the staffer that is on the floor, the Governor is resisting this Amendment He is opposed to it, and lastly and as importantly, newspaper at home has editorialized against just as late as last Sunday morning. Amendment They said that it's unnecessary, and it puts too much... too much power, excuse me, in the hands of one person. So I ask for the indulgence of the people and your understanding on this Amendment... or my Motion to table, and I would ask you sincerely for your 'aye' vote to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Van Duyne, would the effect of Amendment #1 change the... the board such that there would a shift in political power from one party to another?" Van Duyne: "No. The ironic thing about this is that the port now is comprised, I think, of five Republicans and two Democrats. One Democrat, his term just expires June 1st, and I understand that he is not going to be reappointed. Ι presume that it So will be Republicans and one Democrat. But it does take away all

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

three appointments of the Governor and places that appointment in the hands of the county board chairman, and..."

Cullerton: "Is he a Republican?"

Van Duyne: "And he is a Republican. So, I sort of stand in a peculiar position, defending our port authority in its present form, which is composed of five to two, Republican-Democrat. But you might say to yourself, 'Well, why don't you just let them fight it out amongst themselves?' But..."

"Well, thank you for answering my question. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that there's many people in the House that really care too much about the Joliet Regional Port District. I think that this is a type of a Motion that we have a real nice, straight party vote on, because, you know, we got a situation where a Republican put an Amendment, and the Democrat is opposed to it. And it There should be... Everybody over should be real easy. here should vote green, and everybody over there should vote red, and we should adopt the Motion to table. Τt should be real clear. There shouldn't be any philosophical discussions about the Joliet Port District and whether the Will County Chairman is opposed to the Governor... appointments. It should just be a real clear, Democrats vote 'yes', Republicans vote 'no'. And we should have more of those. We should have more of those, in my opinion."

Speaker Giglio: "We appreciate your remarks, and your point is well taken. Representative Davis?"

Davis: "Does that indicate a bias from the Chair, Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Giglio: "No. No way, shape or form."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the last

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

speaker's remarks notwithstanding, I understand his desire to support a Democrat Member who has offered a tabling Motion to this fine Amendment. Representative Van has said all the reasons why it is a good Amendment, by the The truth of the matter is, the Governor does support the notion that he would give up his appointments to this authority to return it to local control. The Will County Regional Port Authority has been a subject of controversy since last year, when it wasn't exactly not accountable to the wishes of this General Assembly that passed the referendum Amendment regarding an acquisition they It occurred to those of us in the General Assembly that perhaps the accountability of this particular of government should be brought closer to an elective body. also occurs to us that since it is an organization that is aggressive in its acquisition of entities and expansions of that port authority for the betterment of the county and of the port authority and of Will County, that it ought to have two more members. The Governor suggested to me that that's not a bad idea, and I said, 'Okay, I will Amendment on this Bill. And what it would do would be increase the board members by two from seven to return his appointments to the county board. Now, we could have left it at seven and returned just his appointments to the county board, and then the county board would have been four to three with the mayor. And the county board is an elective office, and it can be approached by those who would oppose acquisitions that they re making or support them or whatever, and it is not always Republican. It heen Democrat. It is not a partisan issue. I think Representative Van Duyne indicated, currently there five Republicans and two Democrats that serve on that I have only heard from two members of the board who

### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

oppose this Amendment. I have not heard from the other There is a political requirement in the Amendment and in the Bill that no more than two members political party can serve on that board. So that, indeed, the political bipartisanship has been maintained in the Amendment. I certainly think it's a very good Amendment from an accountability standpoint. Ιt goes, and what Representative Cullerton said, back to local control to the notion that you have an electorate that is closely aligned with the appointment process. And it is not gubernatorial in nature, where they are further removed the process. And I believe, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. that this is a good Amendment. Amendment that should not be tabled, but should remain on the Bill, and let the dialogue continue when it goes back the Senate for a concurrence Motion. So, I would respectfully request all of my Republican colleagues and those enlightened and friendly Democrats to oppose this tabling Motion."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1245. Representative Van Duyne, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Van Duyne: "Just to briefly close and correct a couple of statements that Representative Davis made, Mr. Speaker."

### Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Van Duyne: "If any one of the Republican Members of this House would like to, they can check with the Governor's staff person, and she will correct the Representative's statement that the Governor is not opposed to this Amendment. The Governor very definitely is opposed to this Amendment. The staff person told me that this very day. And so, I wanted to correct that, and in terms of local control, I just want to tell you quite candidly that this is a power grab on the

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

- part of Representative Davis and our new county board chairman, and it does remove the objectivity of the Governor's appointments, and I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1245. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This will take a simple Majority of those voting. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Davis?"
- Davis: "I'd like to verify the Affirmative Roll Call, and poll the absentees."
- Speaker Giglio: "On this question, there are 58 voting 'aye', 55
  voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Gentleman...
  Gentleman moves to... verification. Representative Van
  Duyne moves to poll the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the
  absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Berrios. Breslin. DeJaegher. Homer. Rea."

  Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer, 'aye'. Representative

  Rea, 'aye'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further absentees."
- Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Davis, you... Mr. Clerk, what's the count, now? The count now is 60 'ayes', 55 'nays'.

  Representative Kulas?"
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Leave to be verified."
- Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Speaker Leave is granted. Representative Brookins? Leave to be verified. Representative Dunn, John Dunn. Leave. Representative LePlore, leave to be verified. Representative McGann, leave. Representative Preston. Leave to be verified., Representative Davis, are you... are you ready? Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmative."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Bowman. Braun. Brookins.

  Brunsvold. Bullock. Christensen. Cullerton. Curran.

- 58th Legislative Day

  Currie. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio.

  Giorgi. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Shaw? Leave to be verified? You have leave. Representative Huff. Representative Panayotovich asks leave to be verified. Representative Soliz? Representative Washington? Young. Representative Levin, for what purpose do vou rise? How is the Gentleman recorded?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

  Speaker Giglio: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Hicks.

  Homer. Huff. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. LePlore.

  Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara.

  McPike. Nash. Oblinger."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Breslin votes 'aye'."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative.

  O'Connell. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps. Preston.

  Rea."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Oblinger?

  Representative Oblinger wants to go from 'aye' to 'no'."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Soliz. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Vitek. Washington. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have any questions of the Affirmative Boll Call? Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Representative Leverenz. There you are. Representative DeLeo."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative DeLeo. Is Representative DeLeo in the chamber? Representative DeLeo? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Giglio: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Davis: "Representative Vitek. Mr. Speaker, Representative Vitek."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Vitek in the chamber?

Representative Vitek? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Nash?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative.. "

Davis: "Nash."

Speaker Giglio: "Nash. Representative Nash in the chamber?

Representative Nash? Remove him, Mr. Clerk."

Davis: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Turner? Representative Turner in the chamber? Remove Representative Turner."

Davis: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Keane? Representative Jim Keane?

Remove Mr. Keane."

Davis: "Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell? Is Representative O'Connell in the chamber? Remove Mr. O'Connell."

Davis: "Representative Currie?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie? Representative Currie is in her chair."

Davis: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Huff, I believe, asked to be verified."

Davis: "I beg your pardon?"

Speaker Giglio: "He's in the chamber. He's in the back."

Davis: "Does Representative LeFlore have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Davis: "Representative White?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Jesse White is in his chair."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Davis: "He's in his seat."

Speaker Giglio: "Return Representative Vitek to the Roll Call,
Mr. Clerk. John Vitek."

Davis: "I'm sorry, John. I didn't know that. I wouldn't have called you back."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stezco asks leave to be verified.

Does he have leave?"

Davis: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Steczo."

Davis: "No further questions."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Van Duyne? Representative Van Duyne?"

Van Duyne: "I think Representative Vitek is back on the floor."

Speaker Giglio: "Yeah. He's been replaced. Representative
Turner has returned. Representative Turner asks leave to
be verified."

Davis: "Yes, and I have another question, since you're still doing that. Representative Hicks. Is he in the chamber?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks is in the back of the chamber. Do you have any further questions, Representative Davis?"

Davis: "No."

Speaker Giglio: "No further questions, Mr. Clerk. What's the tally? Mr. Clerk, do you have the count? Are you counting, Mr. Clerk?"

Davis: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mautino, you seek recognition?

Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "To my good friend, Jack Davis, I was just reminded of the Sunday closing law, and therefore, I have to ask that my vote be changed from red to green."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mautino votes 'aye'. Mr. Clerk,
what's the count? On this question, there are 57 voting

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

'aye', 55 voting 'nay'. The Motion to table is adopted. Are there further Motions, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Davis."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Davis on Amendment #2."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Representative Van Duyne did not like the last Amendment. maybe he'll like one. It goes to the heart, again, of accountability. This Amendment would require the Members... the current Members, the way the board is constituted of the regional port authority in Will County to be elected, and they would be elected at the next general election after the effective date of this law. It's as simple as that, and that's the issue, and if you want accountability, we all run every two years, and I think accountability at the ballot box is probably the ultimate accountability, and nobody should have any problem with this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Van Duyne."

Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Really, this is a less ۷an Amendment objectionable than the other one, nevertheless, it still goes along the same path, and I really think that it's ... it would come under the heading legislation in the sense that it addresses no special other port authority in the whole State of Illinois, which there are 13. I presume that Representative Davis has restricted his activities to the Joliet Port Authority in order not to incur the wrath of the people who represent the Tri-State and the Chicago Port Authority, as well as others, but nevertheless, it is specialized legislation, in my opinion. It only addresses the Joliet Port and really, the intent of this is to destroy the present

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

board as it exists today, and I would object to this Amendment and ask you for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Davis, to close,"

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, there is no intent to destroy anything. There's an intent to bring accountability back to a that has... tends... tends to run amuck from time to time. So the question is, at this point, 'Justice' Van Duyne, raising the issue of uniform election codes. believe, addresses the issue properly. I think it's well within the purview of this Legislature who creates municipal corporations, to require that they be elected a basis of singling out that particular one, and he's right about one thing. The rest of the 12 port authorities are not affected by this Amendment. It's just ours. at this point in time, I recommend to you that if you run, they ought to run. and I would hope for the adoption of this Amendment."

Gentleman moves for the adoption Speaker Giglio: "The of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1245. All those signify saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. No? The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'nay'. The voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question. there's 55 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. Mr. Davis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Davis: "No purpose."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to verify the Affirmative Roll, please."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman is within his rights. Mr. Clerk, will you poll the absentees?"

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Berrios. DeJaegher.

  DeLeo. McGann. McMaster. Nash. O'Connell. Terzich."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady changes her vote from 'aye' to 'nay'.

  Representative Vitek, for what purpose do you rise?

  Representative Vitek wants to be recorded as voting 'no'.

  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Absentees. Terzich.

  No further."
- Speaker Giglio: "Mr... Mr. McGann wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk, what's the count? There are 57 voting 'no' and 54 voting 'aye'. Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hate to take the time of the House, but I can't imagine why 57 people would refuse to see an election of a body of the importance and the scope of this magnitude, so I would request a verification of the Negative Roll Call."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Leave to be verified."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. have leave? Leave is granted. Representative McGann asks leave to be verified. Representative McMaster votes Representative 'aye'. McMaster votes 'aye'. Representative Brookins asks leave to be verified. Representative Van Duyne?"
- Van Duyne: "Yes, very quickly, Mr. Speaker. If this should change, I'd like to retain my right to verify the Affirmative Roll Call, too."
- Speaker Giglio: "You're within your rights, Sir. Poll... Mr. Clerk, poll the negative vote. Representative McNamara?

- 58th Legislative Day

  Leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk "Poll of the Negative. O'Brien: Alexander. Bowman. Breslin. Brookins. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Dunn. Parley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Huff. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Soliz. Steczo. Stern. Sutker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Currie asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed...

  Representative Bowman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Negative. Turner.

  Van Duyne. Vitek. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony

  Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Questions of the Negative Roll Call., Mr...
  Representative Davis?"
- Davis: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Capparelli."

  Speaker Giglio: "Representative Capparelli in the chamber?
- Representative Capparelli? How is the Gentleman recorded?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

  Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."
- Davis: "Representative Keane."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Keane in the chamber?

  Representative Keane is in the nurse's quarters."
- Davis: "Representative Nash."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Nash in the chamber?

  Representative Nash?"
- Davis: "Not voting? Representative.. "
- Speaker Giglio: "How's the... How's the Gentleman recorded, Mr.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Davis: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock in the chamber? Representative Bullock is in the back of the chamber."

Davis: "Representative Matijevich."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich is in the chambers."

Davis: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman."

Davis: "Representative Oh, he's... I'm sorry. I verify one of my own off. That was funny."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove him. Remove him from the Roll Call. We did."

Davis: "You got it. Remove him. That's right. That's what...

Representative Laurino."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Laurino. Is Representative Laurino in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded? Laurino."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman."

Davis: "Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Giglio: "Panayotovich? Representative Panayotovich in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman. Representative Keane has returned to the chamber."

Davis: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Turner is in the back of the chambers."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Davis: "Representative Berrios."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Berrios."

Davis: "Not voting, Mr. Speaker. Never mind. Representative Preston."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston is right outside the door, here. Representative Preston is right here, in the well."

Davis: "Representative Dunn."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative John Dunn. How is the Gentleman recorded? The Gentleman is..."

Davis: "I see him. He's above the chamber."

Speaker Giglio: "He's talking with his constituents."

Davis: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman? Representative Greiman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman."

Davis: "No further questions."

Speaker Giglio: "No further questions of the Negative Roll Call.

Representative Regan, for what purpose do you rise?

Representative Regan, do you seek recognition? No. Okay.

Representative Hannig has returned to the chambers.

Representative Panayotovich has returned to the chamber.

On the Verification, the count is 55 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no'. Representative Berrios? Representative Berrios has returned. Representative Berrios votes 'no'.

Representative Nash? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Nash requests to be recorded as voting 'no'. Representative White asks leave to be verified. Mr. Clerk, what's the count? At this time, there are 56 voting 'no', 55 voting 'aye'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, go to the Order of Resolutions, and at this time, Representative Preston is in the Chair."

Speaker Preston: "On House Resolution 577, would the Clerk please read the Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 577, offered by Representative Preston. Whereas, the Illinois House of Representatives wishes to congratulate the officers of the 24th District in Chicago on their innovative program to teach hearing impaired children safety and crime prevention techniques; and whereas, the officers of the 24th Police District in Chicago have given freely of their address this need; and whereas, this child safety program helps children identify police officers as friends and helps to alleviate the fears the young children have of police officers; and whereas, without the financial help and support of the Rogers Park Kiwanis Club, this program would not have been able to function without the significant cost to the Chicago Police Department; and whereas, this program for hearing impaired children has received recognition from the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and from the United States Department of Justice, as an outstanding example of the partnership between law enforcement and the community; therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we congratulate police officers Bruce Rottner, Evelyn A. Summers, Soter Libaris, Daniel Levin, Sergeant Rolf Northfell, and Commander Samuel Anthony. Nestor Chakonis, of the 24th Police District of Chicago and Park Kiwanis Club for their outstanding the Rogers contribution to the protection of our children; and

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

further resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Commander Nestor Chakonis and the police officers of the 24th District of the Chicago Police Department and to the Rogers Park Kiwanis Club."

Speaker Preston: "Let mе just say before this 46 adon+ Resolution, that Commander Chakonis and the police officers of the 24th District of the City of Chicago Department have done an outstanding job in all areas of community involvement, child safety being first and foremost, but being only one of a long list of involvement in this... of this remarkable police department... police They open up the doors of the police district. members of the community for every community endeavor. In fact, the first program we had on child safety that ended in the child safety package of legislation, most of which was adopted by the House and the Senate, came from a meeting at the 24th District Station where we brought in representatives of the Chicago Police Department and the PBI, and John Walsh, from the National Center of Missing and Exploited Children. But the point being that Commander Chakonis and the officers of the District Police Station have been unique and remarkable in being integral members of the community, and they have made children and adults feel that the police in our community are their friends and their neighbors. And that is. indeed, the best way to accomplish law enforcement prevention, by having the members of the community feel that the police are their friends, while we, in Rogers Park and Edgewater and in the 24th District police area very much so that the police officers in our district are very much our friends. And with that, I'd like to move for the adoption. But first, Representative Nash."

Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

I rise in support of House Resolution 577. Commander Nestor Chakonis, Officer Libaris - Soter Libaris, those are the two names that the Clerk mispronounced. My very good, dear friends, the other officers connected with this program. This is a program we should adopt statewide, and I urge... move for the adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Preston: "Alright. The question is, Shall this Resolution be adopted? All in favor please signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Resolution is adopted. And with that, I'd like to introduce, as they would just raise their hands as we introduce them, Commander of the 24th Police District, Nestor Chakonis, Sergeant Rolf Northfell, Police Officer Bruce Rottner, who incidentally is also President of the 'Shomrim' Society, Officer Evelyn Summers, Officer Officer Samuel Anthony and Josephine 'Kaufman', Libaris, who is the Beat Representative in the 24th Police District. I salute you and all your colleagues as well. Commander, would you like to say a few words?"

Commander Chakonis: "First, I want to thank all of you very much for honoring us here this afternoon, especially Preston, Representative Lee who is a very dear friend of ours, as well as a Representative. We work very closely He comes into our station and helps us, and it's two way street. And I think what's happened at the same time, we all had the same idea about the safety of our youth, and what's happened with this program, it's not only taken off city-wide, it's taken off throughout the country and also as far as Canada. I don't know if you know or we have a tape for the hearing impaired, plus the one tape is for the normal hearing, and by getting out for these children, I think we've probably helped quite a few. Last week, we had that tragic thing that happened here in

## 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the state with that poor, young, little girl. We had one mother call our office and thank us very much for having that puppet show that we have for the 'Stranger Danger', and saying that she hoped our program helped her daughter possibly not to talk to some stranger on the street. And I think that's our concern — your children and our children. Thank you very much for honoring us here today, and thank you again."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Breslin in the Chair. We are now going to go to the Order of Senate Bills on Special Order of Agriculture. The first Bill is Senate Bill 211. Senator... Who is the House Sponsor? Representative Saltsman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 211, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois Farm Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, can I have this Bill returned to Second Reading for a simple Amendment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that the Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 211, a Bill for an Act in relation to
  Illinois Farm Development Authority. Floor Amendment #2,
  offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman, on Amendment #2."
- Saltsman: "Yes, all that this Amendment does is make it the effective date upon signing."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 211. And on that question,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The Gentleman now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 211 on Third Reading. Are there any objections. Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 211, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois Farm Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

  This doubles the Authority's bond authorization by 300 million dollars, of which 100 million will be going for the bonding power to perform legislation, and the other 50 million will be going to our biotech industry."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton. Excuse me,
  Representative. Representative Cullerton, for what purpose
  do you rise?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I... I know that we adopted
  Amendment #1, and I know the Bill's on Third Reading, but
  it's also true that Amendment #1 has not been printed and
  distributed, and I wondered if the Gentleman might be
  willing to take... come... come back to it at the end of
  this Order so that we can read what the Amendment... is
  that was adopted?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Would you take the Bill out of the record for a moment, Representative Saltsman? Representative Cullerton has not gotten a copy of it. Would you mind holding the Bill?"

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Cullerton: "The page... The page..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman, proceed."

Saltsman: "Yes, the other fifty million will be... money to be used in agricultural biotech research going for equipment or any type of manufacturing on ag goods. And I ask for adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 211. And on that question. is there any There being no discussion, the question is, discussion? 'Shall Senate Bill 211 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. and 'present'. This Bill, received having the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Representative Ronan. Clerk, read the Bill." Bill 254.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 254, a Bill for an Act relating to gasohol and amending Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you. Madam Speaker and Members of the 254 is an important concept for the State of Senate Bill It deals with a compromise that has been with a number of the major oil companies in the state. the Corn Grower's Association, the ethanol industry. What we've done is we've cut the exemption on ethanol from cents to 2 cents, a penny kicking in upon the Bill becoming signed law. The second cent being knocked off next June. Secondly, what it does is it extends a reciprocity agreement so that in other states that are doing exemptions they have to work with the industry in our state. Finally, it defines alcohol based on cereal grains so that we can

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

eliminate a problem of Brazilian ethanol coming into the State of Illinois. It's an important concept. We made a commitment a number of years ago to the ethanol industry. It's been a booming industry in the state so that obviously this is one of the times that State Government got involved and really aided an Illinois industry to become a real growth industry in the State of Illinois. It's a good vote because it's the vote for the coal manufacturers in southern Illinois. It's a good vote because it's for the corn growers in downstate Illinois, and it's an industry that's produced jobs. I'll be glad to answer any questions about Senate Bill 254. And I move for its passage."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 254. And on that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield for a question."
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."
- Vinson: "Representative, this reduces the subsidy for gasohol.

  Is that correct?"
- Ronan: "That's correct, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "And it attempts to create a situation where Brazilian alcohol won't be used in our gasohol. Is that correct?"
- Ronan: "It creates a situation where we eliminate where we try
  to define the product that can be used in the manufacture
  of ethanol based on cereal grain, which would restrict the
  use of brazilian alcohol. They make their alcohol from
  noncereal grain."
- Vinson: "Okay, now is there anything else in this thing?"
- Ronan: "The third aspect of the Bill deals with the reciprocity arrangements with other states. Other states give incentives. We believe that they should conform to what we're doing in our state, again, because we're from

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Illinois and we should be benefiting companies in Illinois."

Vinson: "I... Io.. You got to explain what... what you mean by that. I think it might be a good idea, but I don't understand what you mean."

Ronan: "Well, Representative Vinson, what we do is that we've got an exemption here in the State of Illinois. Other states have established exemptions that... a double exemption almost, for their products. We feel that if... in order to unfairly compete with our products so that we just want to have our products to have the same opportunity that goes in those states that they give to their producers."

Vinson: "I see. Okay. You know, I... To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Vinson: "The Gentleman's worked very hard on this all Session long and, as a matter of fact, for several years. I personally intend to vote against it because I don't like seeing the subsidy repealed, but I don't think that that should be construed as a party position or anything."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield."

Dunn: "We had a Bill earlier in the House, I think it was House
Bill 753, which was somewhat controversial and to which was
attached an Amendment that all interested parties seemed to
be in agreement with. Do you know how this Bill relates to
House Bill 753 as amended which I think Representative
Steczo is the Chief Sponsor of it? Is this the same or is
it different? If different, how?"

Ronan: "This is... This is the exact same Bill, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "As amended?"

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Ronan: "As amended."

Dunn: "Thank you. That's all I need to know."

Ronan: "That's right. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. in support of Senate Bill 254. In response to the Gentleman from DeWitt, this Bill does not repeal the subsidy on ethanol. What it does is bring into the Bill same concept that has been eluded to before that was embodied in House Bill 753 which reduces the subsidy by 1% upon signing of the Bill and by another percent in June of 1986. The reason for that is because of the booming nature of the industry. It's no longer necessary to subsidy at 4% and this reflects a product of discussions that were held. I should also mention that the other items contained in Senate Bill 254 were items that on their own had passed this House by an overwhelming margin. Senate Bill 254 embodies all of the concepts, and I would urge support of this legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Mautino: "Representative Ronan, these... I agree in total with the reduction in the subsidy; but, for the record, could you tell us how much the subsidy costs the State of Illinois as it pertains to the Road Fund?"

Ronan: "Representative Mautino, as you're well aware that I was

Chief Sponsor of the gas tax increase just a couple of
years ago and we had a similar debate. When I passed the
gas tax increase a couple of years ago, I think with your

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

help but I can't remember, we added approximately \$275,000,000 a year to the Road Fund which has given us opportunity probably of the best road program of any state in the nation. We made that decision as a Legislative Body and I'm happy to see that ... that we're really moving ahead improving the roads in the State of Illinois reasonable. rational basis. What happened with the exemption is every penny, it's estimated, involves about a \$30,000,000 shortfall to the state so that the gas tax increase that we passed a couple of years ago more than offset the exemption. And obviously, there's tremendous other benefits that come into the state with that exemption, though. We've created jobs. We put people to work and we've really had many other economic aspects to the Bill that has been very positive for the General Revenue Fund and for the Motor Fuel Tax Fund so that I feel that everytime we make a decision here, in the General Assembly, we make it based on overall objectives and we put it in part of the mosaic of public policy in this state and that's exactly where this Bill fits in that mosaic."

Mautino: "Madam Speaker, to continue my line of questioning."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Mautino: "I have no disagreement with the progression of elimination of the subsidy. I think it's rather ridiculous that we have an increase in the gas tax and we offer a subsidy for another product that used for the road systems of our state. But I would think that off hand the subsidy we now provide to the industry in the form of the exemption amounts to about 48 to \$50,000,000 a year which comes directly out of the Road Fund. I would hope that there would be additional legislation, additional work in the following and upcoming Sessions to eliminate totally the subsidy because I believe that if we're going to tax a

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

product for the use for our highways it should be a total product coverage which would be ethanol, 'gasanol', and gasohol as well as gasoline. So, with that thought, that you would be moving towards the subsidy reduction in future years, I'd stand in support as well, but it is a law."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Well, I just wanted to clarify a point that was brought up
in the most recent dialogue. It is my understanding that
this sales tax reduction on gasohol won't impact the Road
Pund, except to the tune about 300,000 because only 3% of
the total sales tax receipts in this state go into the
State Road Pund. So, I just wanted to try to get that

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question

point clarified."

Ropp: "Representative Ronan, in our analysis there's some question that there may be some unconstitutionality about this relative to getting involved in international law about trade and so forth. Do you feel this is a problem or not?"

Ronan: "Absolutely not, Representative Ropp. I feel that we've worked very hard on this legislation. We tried to draft it in conformity with acceptable standards, and we feel that we'll be absolutely capable of any kind of review by the court system."

Ropp: "Okay. And this Bill is like House Bill 1090 which you are a part of that everybody agreed to previously. And I..."

Ronan: "Correct."

Ropp: "I support this Bill."

Ronan: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Representative Ronan, to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to briefly respond to the two objections. Ι understand the position αf Representative Vinson's taken. It's an admirable position. I was pleased a couple of years ago when we passed cent exemption because I think what we had was a situation where the Illinois coal industry, the Illinois corn growers, where the ethanol industry, which is coming on line, needed a state incentive in order to expand. ₩.o. made that decision a few years ago and the results have been overwhelmingly positive for the State of Illinois. We've done something as far as creating jobs and really making Illinois the leader in ethanol production and ethanol sales. So that, I understand Representative Vinson's concerns; but, at the same time, we now have to public policy and come in with recommendations for change And I agree with Representative Vinson that makes sense. that this is a great industry, but it's time to have a modern approach to that. As far as Representative Mautino's concerns, we, Members of the General Assembly, will be obviously reviewing exemptions that we passed and the next Session develops, we'll be glad to take a look at this. But we made a commitment. We made a commitment this industry that we want to subsidize it because it's good for Illinois. It's good for coal. It's good for It's good for jobs. When we make a commitment, we corn. better hold to that commitment. We constantly say that want to create jobs in the State of Illinois and we want to people to work. We tell that to the Saturn people on put GM. When we make commitments to industry, we better live with those commitments and we better deliver on our word: because, if we don't, I think industry is going to take a very negative view of this state. And I think we're going

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

to have serious problems on keeping our people to work which is one of the problems that we really have not addressed as adequately as we should."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is..."

Ronan: "So, I move for the adoption and the passage of House Bill... Senate Bill 254."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 254 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 418. Out of the record. Senate Bill 567, Representative Richmond. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 567, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Beef Market Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen Senate Bill 567 is identical to House Bill the House. 1175, which I sponsored and passed in this House It provides some changes in the Beef Market Development Act that were requested by the... by that Association and it... Under the Bill, the Beef Council will be allowed to... allowed access to the financial records of marketing and collection agencies for the purpose of determining compliance of the Act's assessment provisions and authorizes the Beef Council to initiate court action to assessments due from marketing or collection collect agencies, to request court cost and to add 10% of amount otherwise due to the relief sought in the recovery action. The Council also be authorized to petition

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

court for injunctive relief to enforce compliance with the Act. The Bill is, of course, as I say, it passed 114 to nothing as House Bill 1175. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to try to answer."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 567. And on that question, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a good Bill. It attempts to further allow the promotion of an industry and to encourage people to consume the best possible beef that can be consumed in the State of Illinois. It's a Bill that allows the producers to become more involved in a program to merchandise and make more nutritious a product that we all love and enjoy. And I urge your favorable vote."
- All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 875, Representative Ropp. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1032, Representative Richmond. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1032, a Bill for an Act to provide legal assistance to Illinois farmers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that has been developed as a result of the survey that was made from the Rural Route Program at the university of Illinois, that provided a call in service for farmers who had problems that they could

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

present to experts on a panel there at the university, and they have discovered that 35% of the callers were farmers that were in dire need of legal assistance and could And the National Association of Attorneys afford it. General in March passed a Resolution urging all states to involved in a program of this type. And that is the purpose of this Bill. It enacts the Illinois Farm Legal Assistance Act, establishes the Farm Legal Assistance Board and authorizes the Board to make grants to not-for-profit legal assistance providers for establishing programs to legal services to eligible farmers."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1032. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and I rise in support of this fine Gentlemen οf the House. piece of legislation. The background is this. The Federal Government is cutting off... in an effort to balance our budget, is cutting off funds for legal assistance throughout the nation and soon the Legal Assistance Foundation in Illinois will not be allowed to operate and poor people who need legal assistance throughout the not have it. So, what's necessary is for us in the state to step in, in place of the Federal Government, lawyers, for people who can't afford it. for And this Bill doesn't perhaps go far enough in providing assistance for everyone who needs it. But we start off with a very needy group in our state, that being the Now, we recently authorized, I think, \$25,000,000 loans so that farmers could borrow money to pay for a seed so they can plant their seed in time. I think only about, maybe, a million dollars or a million and a half was actually applied for. Well, that's probably because they

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

didn't have a lawyer to show them how to go down there and apply for those funds. And if only that many people actually got the money to pay for the seed, I assume the only other way they could have obtained the seed to plant would be to perhaps steal it. And if they stole thev're probably be... if they get caught, they're going to have to have a lawyer to defend them criminal case. So, I think it's a very good idea that we set up this not-for-profit legal assistance so that it only cost \$436,700. And I think that if this works for the farmers, then we could, perhaps, expand it to help out other poor people who have legal problems throughout I rise in support of this Bill and encourage all those here to support it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I hope that Representative McPike is somewhere within hearing range because this is one where I think he and I can agree. We need not create a welfare program for farmers. That would be wrong and that's what this Bill This is the kind of a Bill... It... I have a time describing how bad a concept this is. It just... it's frustrating to see something like this occur. If you believe in anything about the private enterprise system, if you believe that people ought to do it on their own, I have told to me many times by farmers and which I think most of the farmers in my district believe in, government ought not be coming in and hiring lawyers and giving them away free to farmers. That's a bad idea. It's the kind of concept that the far out left wing liberals have tried to foist off on this country for welfare recipients and everything else, and all they've

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

driven welfare recipients deeper into poverty. And that's what this will probably do for farmers is drive them deeper into poverty. I urge a 'no' vote on this thing. I think it's a terrible concept and no self-respecting farmer is going to tell you that he's for this."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Ropp: "Representative, can you tell me is there any fiscal impact should this Bill pass?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond."

Bichmond: "Yes, there is an appropriation Bill."

Ropp: "How much is that?"

Richmond: "It's four hundred and thirty some odd thousand, I think."

Ropp: "And is that anticipated to go until the repealer of this Act of 1987, December 31 or would it increase next year?"

Richmond: "I think that's an annual... it's an annual amount, and it would provide eight or nine attorneys that would be working out of the existing legal aid offices throughout the state, geographically located to service the farmers through the entire state."

Ropp: "And is it true that there was only about 1.25 million of the twenty-five million that we passed that was sought for by farmers in the State of Illinois?"

Richmond: "It's my understanding it was over four million."

Ropp: "Over four million. Up to... and we have allocated twenty-five million."

Richmond: "Yes."

Ropp: "I guess I'm a little bit puzzled as to why we had such a clamor for all these dollars and then when it finally came

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

down to the authorization and the usage of those dollars, we had so few people seek them. Can you answer that?"

- Richmond: "Well, the... I have some thoughts on it, yes. The one thing was that it was late, our program was late and a lot of the farmers were busy planting if they could find the seed. And the... Their credibility had to be... their credit worthiness had to be determined by the lender and in many cases, that became the big problem. Beyond that, I'm a little mystified too, because I... we had indication that the need was certainly there and I still believe it is. In fact, I think the condition has worsened even since then."
- Ropp: "Does this... these attorneys are they so skilled in their knowledge that they attempt to advise a farmer on how to farm, or do they attempt to tell him how to follow the foreclosure procedure?"
- Richmond: "They will not attempt to advise him on farming procedures, of course. They will be talking to him about his legal needs. Some of them would include how to get out of the farming business, I presume, because they're in trouble and need that type of advise and actually don't have \$5,000 to pay an attorney to do it. The attorneys will be selected by the Board which is made up of the Attorney General, the Director of Agriculture and one other one, that's the State Treasurer."
- Ropp: "In other words, these attorneys could even urge them to go back to school to become attorneys."
- Richmond: "Well, I think that's a little far fetched."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."
- Woodyard: "Representative, who asked that a Bill like this be introduced? Did this come from farmers or where did this

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

come from?"

Richmond: "As I explained earlier, it... the need for it was determined as the result of the Rural Route Program at the University of Illinois. Thirty-five percent of their callers... calls from farmers indicated a dire need for legalassistance which they no longer could afford. So, they reported that to the Attorney General and the Attorney Generals' Association, Federal... the National Association of Attorney Generals' passed a Resolution asking all states to get involved in this type of program. So, actually this is the Attorney General's Bill. He has requested that we consider this proposition."

Woodyard: "It's the Attorney General of the State of Illinois"
Bill?"

Richmond: "Yes."

Woodyard: "How many of these attorneys will be hired?"

Richmond: "The amount that the appropriation Bill is set for would allow eight or nine attorneys."

Woodyard: "Eight or nine?"

Richmond: "Yes."

Woodyard: "Do you know where they will be?"

Richmond: "They will be operating out of the existing legal aid

offices that are in existence now throughout the state, and

I'm assured that they will be distributed geographically to

where they would have easy access to all parts of the state
as near as possible that nine can be accessible."

Woodyard: "Does Farm Bureau support this Bill?"

Richmond: "Yes, they do."

Woodyard: "Do the other farm organizations support it?"

Richmond: "Yes, they do."

Woodyard: "Well alright, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Ryder: "Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Bill, but I would gladly yield my time. I think we saw the Majority Leader come onto the floor; and, since his presence was requested earlier, if he's present, I'd be glad to yield to him."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is not seeking recognition.

Representative Plinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Richmond, to close."

Richmond: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very briefly. I think you have an idea of what the Bill is. I know there are some that are philosophically opposed to this type of thing, but it isn't anything that's particularly new because we have had legal assistance for those who couldn't afford it otherwise. not saying that all farmers need that type of assistance certainly, some of them do and they are not necessarily those who are totally hopeless. But there are have assets that are sizable, but their w ho indebtedness is more sizable than their assets and actually do not have the means to procure the type of legal assistance that might keep them producing in the major industry of this state. I ask for your 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1032 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative

Countryman, one minute to explain your vote."

58th Legislative Day

McPike."

June 20. 1985

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a new concept Illinois, one which we don't have in any other area of the As a matter of fact, we're doing a pretty poor job in this state in providing public defenders where lawyers are needed by court actions. And we have not taken the responsibility of providing those lawyers to the county where we have provided subsidies for state's attorneys. also haven't provided lawyers for the poor and now we're going to supply lawyers for the farmers. I represent a farming district. I'm a lawyer. When I'm not down here, I practice law with those people. And I have yet to turn down a client because they can't pay. I think the fine Representatives who are sponsoring this Bill misconstrued again, and I just don't think it's I don't need... I think we need to socialize the legal profession or socialize the farming industry providing them with this special interest and I vote 'no'." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think those people that are voting red should be ashamed of themselves voting against poor people like this. These poor farmers don't have anywhere to go and they're looking for some legal These attorneys can't afford to give away their time. You These farmers are desperate. know, they're They've lost... well, they've had three, four thousand acre farms, you know, worth four or five million. Five, 600,000 a year from the PIK program. That's gone. get rid of their dairy herd. Farm subsidies are down price support for milk. Ropp hasn't been able to pass his Bill. These people are desperate. Salmonella crisis.

What are we going to do to help these poor farmers.

here is a reasonable approach. It just says, 'Well,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

pay 400, 500,000 a year to some attorneys. God knows the attorneys need the help. So, here is the chance to help the poor people and rich attorneys at the same time. Alright.

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler, one minute to explain your vote."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And before I would explain my vote, I would request that if this require... if this receives the required number of votes, I would ask for a verification. But, of course, I do oppose this legislation for two reasons. Number one, it is an elect Neil Hartigan to the Governor's post Bill, and I, of course, have no interest at all in electing Neil Hartigan as Governor. The second reason why I oppose the Bill is because it is a Bill to provide business for attorneys and I know no needy attorneys."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from... the Gentleman from DuPage,

  Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I also seek a verification. This Bill is even worse than Representative McPike told us it was. This is a Bill which, not only will socialize farming in the legal profession, but will politicize it. These legal service people will be down here, Representative, and they will be seeking more help for the farmers. They're going to become the farmers lobbyists. Vote 'no' on this Bill. This is no laughing matter. Vote 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Soliz."

  Soliz: "I rise in support of this piece of legislation, Madam

  Speaker, Members of the House. As a legal services lawyer

  for approximately seven or eight years, I had occasion to

  represent many unfortunate citizens of this state and of

  this country, among them, steel workers, united auto

  workers, many business people that went bankrupt that

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

subsequently they couldn't pay their bills, many people and individual of all professions, all careers and I just don't see why we can't support legal services for farmers that can't pay their law attorney. or farmers can't... are i n foreclosure proceedings, our farmers have too many creditors and they legal assistance. They can't afford an attorney, and I think that this is a very good Bill. It only is going to help farmers that can't pay for legal services on their There is going to be ineligibility criteria so that farmers that can afford legal services can go out and for their own attorneys, but farmers that are poor, farmers that are going bankrupt, or farmers that are in foreclosure proceedings can have their attorneys if they need them. I will support this legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing. Excuse me,
Representative Regan, one minute to explain your vote."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I come from an area that has a considerable amount of farmers in it as well as an urban area. When the \$25,000,000 package came through on the loans, I assumed that my farmers great need and wanted that help. I voted for the \$25,000,000 to stand the criticism of my constituency farmers. They did not want any help from the Legislature. They felt that that was a bad law. I don't believe that they're going to like this law either and I fully intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you rise?"

Cullerton: "I just have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Breslin: "State it."

Cullerton: "What do we do when two people request a verification?

Do we have to..."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Breslin: "We have a verification, Representative."
- Cullerton: "But which one does the verification? Do we get to pick ourselves or... I don't think Representative Koehler knows as many people as Representative McCracken and I would prefer that Representative Koehler be the one that do the verification."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, one minute to explain your vote."
- Preston: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel that my name
  was mentioned in debate by Representative Koehler when she
  referred to needy attorneys. And since this legislation
  will help, not only the farmers, but the needy attorneys.

  I'm voting in favor of it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 52 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Representative Koehler has requested a verification. Representative Richmond request a Poll of the Absentees. The one That's Representative Frederick. absentee. Is the Lady in the chamber? Representative Frederick. Okay. Proceed. then, with a verification of the... She is? Representative Hicks."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Madam Speaker, will you record me as an 'aye' vote, please?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Hicks wishes to be recorded as voting "aye". Proceed with the Poll of the Affirmative."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Berrios. Bowman. Braun. Breslin.

  Brookins. Brunsvold. Bullock. Christensen, Cullerton.

  Curran. Currie. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative... Excuse me, Representative

  Currie asks leave to be verified, Representative Koehler.

  Leave is granted. Proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hawkinson. Hicks. Hannig. Hartke. Homer. Huff. Johnson. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McPike. Mulcahev. Nash. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps. Rice. Richmond. Preston. Rea. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Slater. Soliz. Steczo. Stern. Wait. Washington. Sutker. Turner. Van Duyne. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any questions of the affirmative?

  Before that, Representative Koehler, Representative Dunn
  asks leave to be verified. And Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Lady to withdraw her verification. If she will, I'll give my next pay raise back to the state."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann asks leave to he verified, and Representative Hicks, and Representative Vitek, and Representative Brookins. Representative Vitek, for what reason... You're recorded as voting Representative Vitek asks leave to change his vote to Do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Representative? Representative Capparelli wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye' also. Representative Koehler, proceed."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will proceed.

  Representative Dunn."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn. He has been verified."
- Koehler: "Okay. Representative Farley."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him. Representative Farley is in the chamber. Keep him on the Roll Call."

Koehler: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff is in his seat. And Representative Steczo asks leave to be verified. The Gentleman has leave. Representative Christensen asks leave to be verified. The Gentleman has leave. Proceed."

Koehler: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson is in the chamber."

Koehler: "Representative Kulas."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas."

Koehler: "I see him there."

Speaker Breslin: "He is in his seat."

Koehler: "Okay. Representative Laurino."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino is in his seat."

Koehler: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McAuliffe is in his seat."

Koehler: "Representative Nash."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash is in his seat."

Koehler: "Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell is by his seat."

Koehler: "Representative Parke."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke. Representative Parke.

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "He's in his seat."

Koehler: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is. He is in the chamber."

Koehler: "Representative Slater."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Slater. How is the Gentleman

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Bemove him."

Koehler: "Representative McPike."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike. Representative McPike.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him."

Koehler: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman. Representative McPike has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call.

Representative Greiman. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him."

Koehler: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich is voting 'no'."

Koehler: "Okay. Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asked to be voted in person.

Representative Capparelli changed his vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Koehler: "Thank you. That's all, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "What is the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Slater has returned to the Roll Call... returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call. On this question there are 67 voting 'aye', and 50 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1182, Representative Hartke. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1182, a Bill for an Act in relation to ownership of agricultural land by certain corporations.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1182 is an Act in relation to ownership of ag land by corporations and partnerships. It requires that they file

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

an annual report with the Department of Agriculture each year. We passed a similar Bill out of the House Representative Woodyard on a 111 to 1 vote. I would answer any questions and if not, I'd request an affirmative vote." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1182. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion. The question is. 'Shall Senate Bill 1182 pass? A11 those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted The Clerk will take the record. who wish? On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Tn addition to the other Bills, a Bill, Senate Bill 497 has added to this Order of Business. It's found on page four your Calendar. on Representative Richmond will. present the Bill. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 497, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to license and regulate grain dealers engaged in the business of purchasing grain from the producers thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen Senate Bill 497, which passed in the Senate 59 the House. to nothing, amends the Grain Dealers' Licensing Act to require that an applicant for a grain dealers license have a net worth of \$50,000. Then it was amended... Amendment.... That Amendment would allow grain dealers who are already licensed in Illinois to continue their business until the first renewal date after January 1, 1988, as long as they maintain a net worth of at least \$20,000. On the first renewal date after January 1, 1988, they would

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

to have amassed a net worth of \$50,000, of course, the idea being that we want more net worth proof in the grain dealers to help protect the farmers who store their grain there."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 497. And on that question, is there any discussion? Mr. Clerk, can you clear the board? There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this... Representative McNamara asks to be voted 'ave'. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Special Order of Business of Elections. will go to the Special Order of Business on Elections. first Bill is Senate Bill 237, Representative Stern. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 237, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill broad bipartisan support. It would amend the Election Code to permit a voter to cast an absentee ballot in person at the office of the election authority in the municipalities and in the townships of Illinois in the general and primary elections. Voters are now permitted to vote absentee in these offices in the odd numbered year This Bill would simply extend that privilege to elections. all elections. I point out as a kind of example for suburban areas and for rural areas, often a voter must travel all the way to the county seat which can be a

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

protracted distance in order to cast an absentee ballot. Rock Island County is a 125 miles from one end to the other, which means if the county seat is right in the middle it's at a 120 mile round trip for a voter at either end of the county. This can save your constituents a great inconvenience and difficulty: deal o f and. when consider that absentee voters are frequently the elderly, the ill, or the busy business person, this could be much appreciated. I will be happy to answer questions if anybody has any."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
  Bill 237. And on that question, is there any discussion?
  There being no discussion, Representative Olson, to close."
- Olson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Stern has done an admirable job of describing what the essence of 237 is. I have a specific example in my rural district where voters in Mendota, Illinois might have to drive 27 to 30 miles to Ottawa to cast a vote. This is endemic over the entire state. This is an important piece of legislation. It has bipartisan support. We like to see 118 votes on this. I urge an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 237."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 237 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 616, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 616, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second... This Bill has been read a second time previously. This Bill was moved to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Third Reading previously today. Senate Bill 616, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 616 in its original form - and the original language is still included - provides that ... provides limits on the validation of petitions in elections relative to unit district formation when certain publication requirements are not met to petitions filed and elections held prior. you know, to the effective date of this Act. I was... a provision on publication that has required some difficulty and something that should be adhered to petitions and elections are filed. Amendment #1 was adopted to this legislation yesterday, and Amendment creates the Toxic Art Supplies in School Act: and, as was explained when the Amendment was adopted yesterday, establishes requirements for the purchase of art supplies containing toxic substances for certain grade levels. meaning kindergarten through sixth, and seven through 12. School districts and schools are prohibited from ordering purchasing art supplies containing toxic substances for use in those grades and warning labels must be attached. substances purchased must conform to the standard of the American Society for Testing and Materials. standard D-4236. It provides for inserts if, in fact, the warning label cannot fit all the information. It provides that the Illinois Department of Public Health should develop a would be provided to the State School Superintendent who would then distribute those lists to the throughout the state to provide them with the information necessary to make certain that these are not purchased. It's effective for the 1986-1987 school year. So, there is

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

a year yet before the provisions of this Act must be complied with; but, in terms of the discussions that we had yesterday, I should let it be known that I was informed last night that the manufacturers of the art supplies, who would be affected by this Act, have no opposition. The language in Senate Bill 616 provides the... what was agreed to by them... by the Senate Sponsor and, in fact, the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce who had taken an opposition standpoint from the introduction of this Bill when it was heard previously in the Senate, now is neutral on this legislation. I would answer any questions and would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 616. And on that guestion, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 6...'... The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, do you wish to discuss this Bill?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

McCracken: "I thank the Sponsor. He informed me this morning that the manufacturer was not in... the groups were not in opposition to the Bill. Candidly though, I don't see any need for this Bill. Can you tell me what... I mean, if the child touches the crayon and it's toxic as defined in the Act, that that crayon has to be labeled? I mean, are we dealing with a real problem or not? What is it that is the problem?"

Steczo: "Representative McCracken, it's been brought to the attention of many that the art supplies in some instances that are used, especially in kindergarten through sixth grade, do, in fact... are, in fact, toxic or create a... or embodied therein, are a certain amount of toxic substances.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

California has acted to pass legislation similar to this. We are basically requiring that those materials, especially if they can be ingested by small children and especially since ingested by small children can create even more of a serious problem in terms of long range health problems, et cetera, than, for instance, if they were to be ingested by an adult, it's a means of protection and it's a means of providing warnings in terms of the handling of those materials and the action should be taken should something improper happen to children in those age groups as a result of ingestion of those substances."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

McCracken: "I understand that the intention is good and I have a good relationship with Representative... who is Chairman of the Cities and Villages Committee. We've worked well often together. But I've got to tell you. 1 don't think there has been a case made to substantiate the necessity of this Act, and I don't think there has been case made that the Act is reasonable relative to the manufacturers. I'm sure that he has been told that the manufacturers are not in opposition to this Bill. doubt that. I suspect if they're not in opposition, however, there may be reasons other than the merits of this which caused that. I cannot believe that Amendment addresses a problem which is a substantial issue. If you look at the definition of 'potential' or if you look at the definition of 'toxicity', 'toxicity' is a definition which includes, among other things, potential human carcinogens. Now, we all know that carcinogens are bad for but what is a potential human carcinogen? Do we know? Is it defined anywhere else? I don't see it defined anywhere else. Also banned is any substance having a

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

potential for causing a chronic adverse health affect determined to some standard for the American Society for Testing and Safety. Now, what are we talking about, We're talking about labeling requirements. labeling requirements cause a child who would otherwise eat crayon not to eat that crayon? Do the labeling requirements cause the teacher who would otherwise keep certain supplies out of the reach of children not to put them within the reach of children? It is just another example of a problem that does not exist, of a solution to problem that does not exist. I don't fault the intent. I respectfully oppose the Bill. It's just a silly Bill and there is just no problem that it addresses."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, on the question."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Leverenz: "How many casualties have occurred to bring about this type of legislation?"

Steczo: "Representative Leverenz, I don't have access to that information. I really do not know. And if you're talking about long range affects, I... It's something, I think, that may not be available at the present time."

Leverenz: "This covers schools?"

Steczo: "Correct."

Leverenz: "Does it includes drug stores?"

Steczo: "No."

Leverenz: "Grocery stores?"

Steczo: "It affects the items that will be available for purchase in schools. The schools will be given a list of supplies that they will not be able to purchase. Those supplies will be manufactured by companies that comply with a certain testing standard and the companies have said that

#### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- since they comply with that testing standard currently, that... that they would have very little difficulty in complying with the provisions of this legislation."
- Leverenz: "If they comply now, who, then, will not be able to supply, Crayola or Sanford Ink in my district or...?"
- Steczo: "I think there... those... those particular items, although not an expert in this matter, would probably be okay, but there may be various other kinds of paints and other things that could, in fact, be toxic."
- Leverenz: "The first thing that came to my mind is, you buy them books and all they do is eat the covers, you know.' Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady... The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

  The question, is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All

  those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In

  the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main
  question is put. Representative Steczo, to close."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 616 in its current form, I think, does a important thing in terms of trying to protect small children who are... who could presently have access to these various supplies from perhaps causing themselves, by ingestion, undue harm for the future. There is, in the Bill, a definition of 'toxicity'. There is a provision that provides that toxic substances that are manufactured according to the American Society for Testing of Material which is a process that certifies these various materials. The legislation has been approved after negotiation with the Senate Sponsor by the very manufacturers of these art supplies. I was engaged in conversation with members...

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

persons who represent the various school districts throughout the state and they indicated to me, in this present form, this Bill is okay with them, too. So, I think that as a potential safeguard for our children in schools because, potentially, this could be a hazard, and California has already passed such legislation, and other states are considering it as well, I think it's well worth our while to give this Bill consideration and to provide enough votes for its passage."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 616 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
  Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 997, Representative Young. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 997, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young. Anthony Young."
- Young: "Madam Speaker, I'd like leave to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
  the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
  Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no
  objection? The Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on
  Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 997, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, offered by Anthony Young."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young."

- Young: "What Amendment #1 does it was recommended by the staff on both sides of the aisle to make it clear that the certified ballots we're talking about are the applications for the ballots. It also makes it clear that if one of these certified ballots is returned nondeliverable, that they will not be mailed in subsequent years. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 397. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We concur in Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 337. And we urge its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate
  Bill 997 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
  those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
  'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there
  any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The Gentleman now asks leave for immediate consideration for Senate Bill 997 to be heard on Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 997, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young."
- Young: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
  Bill 997 provides that a college student, who is residing
  out side of his election precinct and who is eligible to
  vote, may file a notice with the authority of his home
  jurisdiction which would entitle such a voter to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

automatically receive an absentee ballot application for every election in which such voter is entitled to vote for the following two year period."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 997. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Young, just so I understand how this would work. If a student who is going to be away from home at college, either for the primary or the general election, if they wish to vote at home, they would file a notice with the election authority of their home precinct that they'll be away for college. And as a result of that, the election authority must automatically mail an absentee ballot by certified mail to the student. Is that correct?"

Young: "Not a ballot, but a ballot application."

Cullerton: "I'm sorry."

Young: "Not the actual ballot, but the ballot application."

Cullerton: "Oh, the absentee ballot application. And then, of course, the student would fill out that application and apply. If the student didn't fill out the application and apply, then they wouldn't receive the absentee ballot, right?"

Young: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Now, you... According to the law, they would... they would automatically receive this application for two years after the date that they first signed up. Now, what's the reason for that two years? The reason why I ask is because most students, you know, move around their addresses at least every year. And I'm just wondering why you have it for two years."

Young: "The purpose for the two year period is when students go

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

away to school, normally they are gone for at least two years and not four years. And that relieves the student of the problem of having to reapply for every election that may occur within the two to four year period he's away from home."

Cullerton: "But if the students move, then they will have the obligation of coming back to the election authority and asking... and notifying them of a new address, right?"

Young: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Okay, now, do... was this Amendment that we adopted
was this in response to a request by the Chicago election
authority?"

Young: "No."

Cullerton: "Do you know what their position is on the particular Bill?"

Young: "No."

Cullerton: "Do you have any idea how... if there is any cost involved or how much the cost would be involved with mailing by certified mail these applications for absentee ballots?"

Young: "I think the cost would be minor statewide."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Young, to close."

Young: "I would just let everyone know that this Bill is not limited to Chicago. It would allow students throughout the state to receive absentee ballot applications automatically

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

after their first application, and I urge a favorable vote.

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 397 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Representative Homer. Representative Matijevich, one minute to explain your vote."
- Matijevich: "I'm going to vote 'aye' because this is a good Bill, I really think that John Cullerton points to a major I really think, Mr. Young, that it should amended to make that student apply every election. really think that's a major defect in the Bill. And т would hope that we, you know, I'd like to see it stay and we'd all agree to it, amend it right here today so we don't have to go back and reconsider that. I think that will tell you that... also that that is a major Like everybody else that does apply for a absentee ballot, they apply each election. And I think students should be no different; that it should be through an application for an absentee ballot. I'm going to vote 'aye', but I really think you have a major defect which I'm sure the Governor, if he signs it, would amendatorily veto it in that regard. But why go through that process?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman, one minute to explain your vote."
- Countryman: "Well. I don't think it is a major defect because it's only sending out an application for absentee ballots. it's not sending out the ballot. I think that's the distinction that needs to be made. So. it's application. The student then must send back the application before he gets the absentee ballot and it in essence will speed up the process in not having him make the request for the application for an absentee ballot. So, I think it's a good Bill and we ought to vote for

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern, one minute to explain your vote."

- Stern: "Only in response to Representative Matijevich. This is not an unusual situation. A disabled voter can have an application sent to him automatically for a five year period, and this kind of thing could be done for a student as well."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer, would you change my vote to 'aye', please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and 14 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1103, Representative Davis. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 1103 has had a lot of misconceptions, I HOUSE. think, and misinformation floated about its confines. I like to just briefly explain the Bill to you. What it does is provide both political parties opportunity for another option, another option - let me emphasize that word 'option' - at their state conventions with duly elected or duly appointed delegates to convened that state convention. Another option for selecting state central committeemen other than by direct election by What it would do is that if that the primary voters. option was selected by a state convention of the major two political parties, then the county conventions whereby county chairmen are elected in the second Monday after the primary election at that same county convention where county chairmen are elected, state central committeemen

#### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

would be elected by a weighted vote of the precinct elected downstate and committeemen of tho suburban committeemen in ward committeemen in the City of Chicago and suburban Cook County. It is only an option, you with this Bill with the notion that if that option were selected by a state convention after T I m lengthy debate an examination of that possibility contrast to the others, we think that this particular option would give the party a more direct role in its own affairs to elect its own leaders and to strengthen that particular political party. It is my understanding to preclude a question that might arise that there may be some national Democratic rules in the National Democratic Convention or Committee that may preclude the State of Illinois Democrat Party from selecting that option, but I'm not certain of that. So, I bring to you the Bill for alternative option and an option only at a state convention for that convention to turn to if it chooses to within the party go to the option of selecting state central committeemen or party leaders from its ranks the same way that county chairmen are selected by weighted elected precinct committeemen and of suburban committeemen and of ward committeemen in the City of Chicago. basically is the Bill and I will answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman... The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1103. And on that question, the Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "I rise in great opposition to this Bill. I think what
Representative Davis calls misconceptions and
misinformation is probably, in fact, a strong effort by the
Republican Party to close out the women of this Party. And
you may ask why I am standing in defense of the Republican

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

women - because I was a woman before I was a Democrat, and I happen to think this is a very important principle. I think that to pass this Bill will be to close out, not only those Members of both parties who would participate in the action, I think it would also close out the voters whom we are trying very hard to lure in to primary participation. To vote for Representative Davis' Bill would be a step backward, I believe, into the smoke filled closed parties of the past. I urge a red vote on this."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I,
too, at this time would have to be opposed to this Bill.

We have seen the Bill in years passed. We've seen it in
Conference Committee Reports in another fashion usually
coming over to the House from the Senate. And in response
to many phone calls from women in my district, Republican
women and in response to the Federation's position, I would
have to be opposed to the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Madam Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Sutker: "Representative Davis, in our analysis, it shows that
this Bill applies only to the Republican Party. In your
statement you suggested it applies to both parties. Does
it, in effect, only provide attention to alternative A
under the statute as it now exists, or does it also include
application to alternative B?"

Davis: "Well, it's A only, but the Democratic Convention could choose that if your rules of the Democratic National Committee and your State... Republican State Central Committee provide for that or your Convention would adopt it. It's my understanding that may not be the case in your

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

party."

Sutker: "Now, as I understand the present law, the Republican Party acts under alternative A and the Democratic Party acts under alternative B. Are you suggesting in your explanation that this is an alternative under A or under both A and B?"

Davis: "I'm suggesting it's alternative C or a third option and I'm saying to you that right now, I think we operate under A and you under B. This is option C or a third alternative and that, Representative Sutker, the Democratic Party, of course, need not do that. And it is my understanding you may be precluded from doing that by your own national committee rules."

Sutker: "Well, I would like to, Madam Speaker, for the record address an argument to the Bill to suggest to the Representatives here that this approach is something that, as Chairman of the Illinois Democratic Party, I could not accept in that it moves exactly in the opposite direction to which we have been proceeding in the past, mainly, to bring more people in the process and not to exclude or remove people from the process. I, therefore, will have to vote 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Hadam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Harris: "Representative, so that we can clarify what we're talking about here in terms of exactly who this Bill applies to. The Bill as I read it is fully contained under alternative A. Is that correct?"

Davis: "It is an option under alternative A."

Harris: "It is an option under alternative A."

Davis: "That's correct."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Hartke: "The Republican Party is the party which selects alternative A. Is that correct?"

Davis: "That's correct. Currently that is the case."

Harris: "The Democratic Party is the party which accepts alternative B. Is that correct?"

Davis: "That is also correct."

Harris: "Therefore, the Bill really only applies to the Republican Party right now. Is that correct?"

Davis: "Well, it is not by law. That is by option at State
Convention."

Harris: "I understand. They would have to, however, select alternative A in order to exercise this option."

Davis: "That is correct."

Harris: "Since their National Party rules, as I understand, prohibit that selection, we are really only talking about something which affects the Republican Party here. Is that... Would you agree?"

Davis: "Well, that's currently is the case. However, I can't speak for the Democratic National Committee who may see the wisdom of this effort in strengthening their own party."

Harris: "Thank you. Can you tell me how many years it's been that we have elected by primary elector our state central committeeman?"

Davis: "I think it has always been the case to this point."

Harris: "Thank you. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it has been approximately 42 years that we have had direct election of our state central committeemen. That is something which we should keep in mind here. In other words, our doors have been opened to direct election for 42 years. What this option does in essence is close the doors to the elective process. The previous speakers have made reference to the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

fact of the returning to smoke filled room. I won't go But I will say that because, perhaps, some state that far. central committeemen in our party who have been elected bу primary electors, in other words, bv Republicans because they have not met, perhaps, with the acceptance of certain county chairmen, now, we have to come up after 42 years with an option to close the doors to those people. Let me tell my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, this Bill basically deals only with the Republican Party. You select another option. This Bill is contained completely within alternative A. You do not alternative A. We do. I would suggest to you that it will be appropriate that you vote 'present' because a 'yes' vote or a 'no' vote in no way affects what happens in the Democratic Party. Your own party Chairman stood up on the floor and said it would be an inappropriate action for the Democratic Party to exercise this option. Indeed, it is an inappropriate action for them to exercise this option. maintain it's an inappropriate action for the Republican Party to exercise this option. It's closing our doors. would strongly recommend on my side of the aisle a 'no' I'd like a 'no' vote on the other side of the aisle, but a 'present' vote might be the better one to take. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the
opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main
question is put. Representative Davis, to close."

Davis: "Well, you can see, Madam Speaker, that there are

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

misconceptions about the Bill. With all due respect to Representative Sutker and Representative Stern, I wasn't woman before I was a Republican and I probably will have the sex changed before I become a Democrat. But. this is... In fact. I was a Democrat once, but that... so was the President. The truth of the matter is ... Now truth is out, folks. The truth of the matter is, Representative Stern, it is not what you say that it is. It is not an attempt to preclude anyone from becoming a state central committeeman or committeewoman by gender. That is not the case. In fact, I think iust the reverse might possibly happen. What is going on at this point and time is that we see an erosion of the political parties terms of registration. We see that declining. We think on side of the aisle that at an optional choice at state convention where that forum would decide and debate this issue at great length that this attempt if it were adopted by that state convention, would strengthen the role of the precinct committeeman who would cast his primary elector ballots for a state central committeeman, who after all and done is a party functionary. And I don't know. Representative Sutker, how many of your state central committee candidates in the Democratic Party that are elected expend funds, but I know that a great number of funds are expended in our party for what seems to be a cause to become an elected party official where those funds should probably be used in an attempt to defeat you guys on the other side rather than to defeat each other in primaries. It seems to me that this option should be available to the Republican State Convention and should he and thoroughly debated so that that issue can be discussed decided. The forum would just simply change to our convention. In response to Representative Harris. It

### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

seems to me, Representative Harris, that we are not closing the door on an elective process for party officials, as we don't... we have no desire to do that. It seems to me that what we're trying to do is strengthen the internal structure of a political organization by this particular I might also point out to you that the Republican State Central Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen, last week, a ago today, voted 60% to 40% to endorse Senate Bill week 1103. The Bill was sponsored in the Senate by a state central committeeman of the Republican Party and by the County Chairman of DuPage County. I bring this Bill to you now as an optional device for our debate and discussion our State Convention. I recommend it to you that it will strengthen both political parties should the Democrats turn to option A and use this alternative, but it seems the time has come for us to address this particular issue. And I recommend an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1103 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
  McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."
- McCracken: "Thank you. Just maybe an amplification of Representative Davis. I think one of the prior speakers unfairly characterized this as an issue of the sexes. If you look over here, I think you'll find far more women proportionate to our total than you do on the other side of the aisle, a fact which is sometimes lost upon the media and the mythmakers. So, let's not forget that."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentle... The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."
- Zwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As both a woman and Republican, I think it's necessary that I get up and comment on this Bill and tell you why I am going to vote

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

'no' on this measure and ask the rest of you to do the The earlier Representative, in fact, just mentioned that we do have more Republican women in this Body than do Democratic women or that we do at any other level of government. Part of the reason for that is elect... the election process works. When the people go to polls they elect us. When the people go to the polls voting for central committeemen, they will elect us. They may not if it is elected by the precinct committeeman. think it is important to maintain the current program I see no reason for change. This Bill has been introduced for probably ten years by those in the party who want to shut out the electorate from voting for inner party offices. It is another way that we attract voters to the Republican primary. Give them another thing that they can vote on. Let them go to the polls and elect their central committeemen just like we've always done it. There is no reason to change. It's a good process. It worked for แร and I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner, one minute to explain your vote."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I know that the Members on the other side of the aisle suggested that we, as Democrats, not get into this fight, but a few of us do have Republican constituencies in the City of Chicago. I happen to have a few and I heard from them, and they told me that they're opposed to this Bill. And for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no' and encourage as many Democrats, even though they think they may not have a Republican in their area, there are one or two and they want you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Ewing, one minute to explain your vote."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I sorry that we don't have a few more green votes up there. This is a request... this isn't going to affect the but it's a request by the... It isn't Republican Party. going affect the Democratic Party, but it is a request that is very important to those of us who feel that we can improve the structure of the Republican Party. There has been some arguments against this Bill they brought up really don't hold water. It's not anti-woman. It's not a smoke filled rooms, but it's merely a chance to make our State Central Committee and our County Chairmen's Organization work closely together and to make party. Now, the only good reason that the Democrats could have for voting against that would be they would fear a stronger Republican Party."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I would suggest that you look very carefully at this. We're always saying that we want people to participate in the voting So, first we take away voting Superintendent of Public Instruction. Next, we take away the right to vote for the Supreme Court Clerk. now talking about merit selection of Judges. We don't vote for them anymore. They're talking about appointing circuit clerks. Now, we're going to appoint these in effect by letting the party members. That's point number one. number two, I was very interested in hearing that we should have this option because this is a party functionary. Then I would suggest to the Sponsor that maybe we ought to appoint all the committeemen because they are functionaries, too. I think this is a very, very bad Bill.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

And I hope that people really look at it carefully."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to vote 'aye', because it's been experience in Chicago in the races for state central committeemen that the person who gets first spot on the ballot always wins, no matter who he's endorsed by. in Chicago the office appears on the very bottom of ballot. It's the last one on the voting machine and nobody bothers to vote for it. But a person who gets first spot on the ballot is invariably elected and usually doesn't anything to do with the party organizations. We have a fellow elected a couple of years ago that in the four served, he never once talked to me. And I'm one of the committeemen in his district. 1 saw fellow. I never heard of him. They get first on the ballot and they automatically get elected. This the way we'll be able to put party leaders, people who are in the best interest of the party in office."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson, one minute to explain your vote."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

As a Republican woman who is elected, I believe that this issue truly is a party building issue. I'm voting 'aye' for that reason. I think the voters out there truly are confused when they go to vote for the state central committeeman. They really don't know who he or she is.

And for those reasons, I think that the 'aye' vote is the right vote for the party. And I think the fears that have been raised have been political fears. "

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris, for what reason do you rise?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A verification if it receives the necessary votes."

"Have... have all voted who wish? Speaker Breslin: The will take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', and 8 voting 'present'. There's been a request for a verification. Representative Davis asks for a poll... there... there are no absentees. proceed with a Poll of the Affirmative. So. The procedure is, Ladies and Gentlemen, for a verification that Members should be in their seat. Unauthorized persons should remove themselves from the floor. When your name called, raise your hand or stand so that the person doing the verification, Representative Harris and Representative Stern, can see you. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"

Piel: "Leave to be verified, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel and Representative Hoffman leave to be verified. Representative Hawkinson, for what reason do you rise? Representative Hawkinson Representative McCracken ask leave to he verified. Representative Countryman asks leave to be verified. does Barger, Stange. And Representative Hensel, for what reason do you rise?"

Hensel: "Madam Speaker, how am I voted?"

Speaker Breslin: "You are recorded as voting 'no'."

Hensel: "Would you change me to 'aye'?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hensel changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Klemm asks leave to be verified, as does Representative Shaw... or excuse me.

Representative Shaw, for what reason do you rise?"

Shaw: "Madam Chairman, how am I..."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "You're recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shaw: "Would you change my vote to 'present'?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman changes his vote to 'present'.

Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell asks leave to be verified."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Barger. Berrios. Bullock. Capparelli. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishay. Daniels. Davis. DeLeo. Didrickson. Ewing. Farley. Giglio. Hallock. Hannig. Hastert. Hawkinson. Hoffman. Hensel. Johnson. Keane. Kirkland. Klemm. Kubik. Kulas. Krska. Laurino. Mays. McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McNaster. NcPike. Nash. O'Connell. Olson. Panayotovich. Parcells., Parke. Bernard Pedersen. William Peterson. Piel. Pullen. Regan. Ronan. Ropp. Saltsman. Stange. Steczo. Stephens. Tate. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. Wait. White. Williamson. Wojcik., And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any... Representative McGann.

Leave to be verified. The Gentleman has leave.

Representative Harris, do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll?"

Harris: "Where are we starting from, please, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "63 'ayes' and 46 'no'."

Harris: "Thank you. Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo is in the chamber."

Harris: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Harris: "Representative Krska."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Krska is in his chair."

Harris: "Representative Kulas."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Harris: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo is in his chair."

Harris: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Harris: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman. The Gentleman is voting 'no'."

Harris: "Excuse me. Representative Saltsman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Tate has asked leave to be verified. Representative Saltsman is in his chair."

Harris: "Representative McPike."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him. Representative Kulas has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call. Representative Laurino has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call."

Harris: "No further challenges, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf asks leave to be verified. Representative White seeks recognition to change his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. On this question, there are 60 'aye', 49 voting 'no'... 47 voting 'no', and 9 voting 'present'. There are 60 voting 'aye', 47 voting no', and This Bill, having received the Constitutional 'present'. Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill Representative Sutker. Clerk, the read Bill. Representative Sutker."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1180, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Yes, Madam Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Assembly. This Bill amends the Election Code in that it provides and sets forth that in the organization and proceedings of the Cook County Central Committee each ward and township committeeman shall have the respected weighted vote determined by the same election; that is to say, the number of primary electors in the nomination of Members of the General Assembly. It merely makes certain that in the future in Cook County that township and ward committeemen use the same basis for determining their weighted votes at meetings and at elections at those meetings. It provides for a consistent standard. It provides for fairness and equity, and I believe has the support of Members of both parties. And it came out of the Senate with a vote of 59 to 0. I'm available for any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1190. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Olson: "Representative Sutker, we now move to plan B, don't we?

This is plan B in a sense. Now, this becomes a Democratic partisan issue, and it would appear that suburban Democrats feel picked on. Is that correct?"

Sutker: "I'm not suggesting that any... all of the suburban

Democrats are picked on. It does not affect the township

that I represent, in that our weighted vote is the same

under either of those proceedings."

Olson: "Have you visited with Eddie Vrdolyak and Mayor Washington of Chicago on this issue?"

Sutker: "This issue was determined in the Cook County Central Committee of the Democratic Party and received unanimous endorsement of all the township and ward committeemen, Representative Olson."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Olson: "Well, because of your fine sponsorship of the legislation and because this issue is indemic to your interest, I me going to support your Bill. Thank you..."

"Well, you're doing a wise thing, Representative Olson." Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1180 pass?' All those in favor vote all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Special Order of Business and Economic Development, Ladies and Gentlemen, appears Senate Bill 39. Representative read the Bill. Clerk. Wyvetter Younge. Is the Lady in the chamber? Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 80. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 80, a Bill for an Act to create the
Bi-state World Trade Center. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn."

Madam Speaker, Senate Bill 80 Plinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. is the so called World's Center Trade Center Bill. affects the City of St. Louis and the metro east area, and the Bi-state Development Agency. In order to do anything that area with bistate, we must, both Missouri and Illinois, pass identical Bills. And what this Bill does is three basic things. It permits Bi-state to promote develop the World Trade Center, to make contracts with all governments; local, state, or federal government; but, under no circumstance can the State of Illinois spend any of the state money involved in this project. It's a permissive thing. We have to wait on Missouri to pass the identical Bill out. Know of no opposition. I ask for a

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

favorable vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 80. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 80 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, i٩ hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 172, Representative Ronan. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 172, a Bill for an Act relating to
  Infrastructure Revolving Loan Fund. Third Reading of the
  Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I think that there have been a couple of Amendments filed this... to this Bill, and I'd like to have the Bill called back to Second Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Representative Vinson has raised an objection. The Gentleman now moves that this Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Ronan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Ronan: "These are Amendments that were requested by the Governor's Office. So, I want the Amendments ignored.

  We're just going to vote on the Bill. We... I accept Representative Vinson, if he doesn't want to go with the Governor's Office Amendments. He knows more from the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Governor's position then I do. So, that he will... We'll just hear the Bill without these Governor's Office Amendments on there."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Vinson on the question."

  Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I have now examined the Amendments,
  and I am willing to defer to Mr. Ronan's desire to serve
  his Governor. And I would like to change my vote from 'no'
  to 'aye'."
- Ronan: "Madam Speaker, we aren't going to put the Amendments on, and I think that Representative Vinson, if he doesn't know what the Governor wants. If Representative Vinson doesn't know what the Governor wants, I sure don't know. So, my attitude is we're going to hear the Bill without the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "I would suggest then that since we have already opened the Roll Call, Representative Ronan, you urge 'no' votes on the... on the Motion to table (sic) since we cannot withdraw the Motion at this time. Representative Ronan is urging 'no' votes."
- Ronan: "No, just because Vinson doesn't know what's going on in the process let's... we'll hear the Amendments. Have all voted on this question who wish? Mr. Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 85 voting 'aye'... 87 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', and 5 voting 'present'. And the Motion carries. The Bill is on Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, on Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 172 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1, Ronan, amends Senate Bill 172."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to enlighten
  Representative Vinson. He obviously was caught up in one
  of his hazes of the day. Senate Bill... Amendment to
  Senate Bill 172 is a request brought to me by the

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Governor's Office of Planning, Jeff Miller, by the Capital Development Board and by the Bureau of Basically what it does is it establishes the reporting procedures for the five year capital plan. It will come under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget as opposed to the Governor's Office of Planning. that that's an agency more adapt to doing this kind of analysis. I listened to their arguments, and I have obviously agreed with that, that the Bureau of the Budget has the staff and the ability to do the five year capital It's something that's long overdue in plan. Government, and I appreciate that this will make us capital planning in a much more reasonable, rational Secondly, we define the reporting date of January 1987 so that we will have a... a mechanism established where we can monitor and evaluate these reports. And then finally, these reports will be granted on a three year basis, and I'll be glad to ... "

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 172. And on that question, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "I just wanted to know for the record whether or not there was trouble in paradise between Mr. Vinson and Mr. Ronan since I thought they were in accord on almost everything."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate
  Bill 172 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
  those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
  'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there
  any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Roman now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 172 on

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave. Proceed on Third Reading, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 172, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Infrastructure Revolving Loan Fund and to create the in Illinois Capital Budget and Capital Improvement Programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 172 is an important piece legislation that... that we've had a lot of discussion about. I passed out similar House Bills, but now it's been consolidated into one piece of legislation that I'm sure will get overwhelming support today. Basically there are components. First, it establishes the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act to establish a National Infrastructure Revolving Loan Fund. One of the real tragedies that we've been experiencing in the midwest and northeast of this country is the huge drop in federal monies coming back to these states. We've had obviously a tremendous growth in the defense industries, which means that a lot of money goes to the states that are defense oriented. Our state and other midwestern and northeastern states are crying for dollars for The needs are tremendous, and we have infrastructure. up vehicles and mechanism to make federal dollars available. That's what that part of the Bill does, think it's crucial that we, in the State of Illinois, have those dollars available to do the infrastructure rebuilding that's so desperately needed. Secondly, it addresses two issues that are also long overdue in State Government. State Government planning should adopt a five year capital plan so that we can evaluate what kinds of capital

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

expenditures are made in this state and that those capital expenditures be done on a reasonable, rational basis so that, as the Departments are spending millions of dollars to rebuild and refurbish facilities, it be done in a overall planning capacity so that we don't have rebuilding and refurbishing done at mental hospitals that are going to be closed within the next year or the next 18 months, that we spend dollars are mental hospitals or prisons that are then converted to veterans' hospitals and veterans' homes. We've really had a lack of capital planning, and this... and this Bill will go a long way in mandating a five year capital plan so that the Governor will lay out his objectives. We in the General Assembly can review those objectives, and we can vote on legislation and vote on programs that make sense. Finally, it sets up a mechanism where the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs will do a local infrastructure study so that we give ... qive grants and... and dollars available to local communities for water projects, and for sewer projects, for and roads and bridges, that they be given on a rational basis, on a reasonable basis, and that dollars not be given out for political considerations but be given out for what's important for the people of the State of it's a comprehensive analysis. I think it makes sense especially as we go into the last week of the Session debating the concept of Build Illinois and debating the concept οf spending over a billion dollars for infrastructure and road projects. We better make sure we in place a vehicle and a mechanism to make sure that the taxpayers are well served. I wholeheartedly move. for passage of Senate Bill 172, and I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning the legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "There being... is there any discussion on

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Senate Bill 172? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 172 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 318, Representative Ronan. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan,"

Ronan: "Okay, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 318 is an important concept. No. It amends the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act to make various changes in the law regulating the use of Illinois Land Bank Funds.

Just out of curiousity has there been an Amendment filed to this on the floor?"

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us if there's been an Amendment filed on this Bill? No, there has not."

Ronan: "Okay. Then we obviously don't need an Amendment to the Bill. This provides a development plan which... well that was adopted in Committee. It's an important concept. It basically deals with the opportunity for State Government to be more involved with land bank funds, and it will really give us a position where we can do something for many of our downstate communities that have experienced a problem especially, for example, in the Peoria area. I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning the Senate Bill 318."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 318. And on that question is there any

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 318 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will the record. On this question, there are 111 voting take 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 319, Representative Homer. I'm sorry, we've already declared, Representative Nelson. Representative Nelson indicates she would have wished to have voted 'aye' on that last Bill. Senate Bill 319, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 319, a Bill for an Act relating to the

Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Senate Bill 319 would simply confer the same benefits that already are conferred by law on enterprise zones throughout the State of Illinois to those businesses which locate within a federal trade zone which bave deemed by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to be a high impact business: that is, one that expected to cause or contribute in a significant way to increases in income and a drop in the unemployment and poverty rates of an area. So, that in essence what we're doing is just simply saying that if a business is a high impact business, it's located within a federal trade zone, that the same tax incentives that are now provided for businesses locating in enterprises zones will also be afforded to these businesses. I would ask for your favorable consideration.

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 319. And on that question is there any

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 319 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 320, Representative Ronan. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 320, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Tuerk, for what reason do you rise?"
- Tuerk: "Has a fiscal note been filed on this Bill?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Would you advise us, Mr. Clerk, please?

  Representative Ronan, do you know if a fiscal note has been filed on this Bill? Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you rise?"
- Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, the... the Calendar indicates that a fiscal note was requested."
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, it was requested last night after the Bill was amended."
- Cullerton: "And is the Bill... Okay, I believe... I believe it has been filed. I believe the fiscal note has been filed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you verify that? Representative Tuerk, the Clerk's Office advises us that one has been filed. It's upstairs in the Clerk' and they will be bringing it down immediately. Representative Ronan proceed on the Bill. Mr. Clerk. you advise us as to whether or not this Bill has been moved to Third Reading? My recollection was that it was held on Second pending the filing of the fiscal note.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Representative Ronan, this Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Second."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 320, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were
adopted previously."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Ronan now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 320 on Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Proceed on Third Reading, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 320, a Bill for an Act to amend Civil
Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan. Excuse me.

Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "It's a parliamentary inquiry. I don't object to this, however, we have a Members who's on the Special Order and who had trouble getting her Bills read yesterday.

Has... has this been read a second time yesterday?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, it was."

McCracken: "Okay. We have another Member, and I'd like to address that after you deal with 320, on the same issue if you don't mind."

Speaker Breslin: "Why don't you come to the well, and we can discuss it while they're presenting the Bill?"

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."

Bonan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Bill 320 is an important concept that we're trying to get established in the law here in the State of Illinois. Yesterday, I was, sorry to say, inadvertently off the floor when an Amendment was added to the Bill that... quite sure of the motivation of the Sponsor, but then again that Sponsor I'm very wary of most motivations of the process. But at the same time we're going to send this Bill over to the Senate, and we're going to let them do whatever they decide is right with that Amendment. Basically what the Bill does, it empowers the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to provide grants of up to 50 percent of the unemployment and workers comp of manufacturing corporations, establish Des manufacturing facility in Illinois in which a 100 or more persons are employed. I think it's important that we make a very clear message to the manufacturing community here in the State of Illinois that we want to establish new jobs. and that we want to create jobs, and that we want to put We feel that this is very people to work. important incentive those corporations and those plants to let to them know that we in the General Assembly are job oriented, and we want to do something for the betterment of the 1111 be glad to answer any questions concerning this legislation. I do have questions about the Amendment but that will be the Senate's was added yesterday, prerogative to do what they think is right on that... Amendment. And I look forward to a 118 green votes on this I move for the passage of Senate Bill 320." fine concept. Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 320. And on that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Tuerk: "What... what was the final figure on the fiscal note?"

Ronan: "Yes, the final figure on the fiscal note was approximately \$5,100,000."

Tuerk: "Well, this would mean then, I presume, that one company could get upwards to \$5,000,000 relief from this Bill, is that the way it stands?"

Ronan: "No, that's the total fiscal impact to the state."

Tuerk: "Well, that's the total but one company could file a claim and get all 5,000,000, isn't that correct?"

Ronan: "Representative Tuerk, I have a little more faith in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs than you do.

I'd assume that they in their judgement will evaluate the programs and policies that come in, and they aren't going to give that kind of a... of a rebate to a company... to one individual company."

Tuerk: "Well, to the Bill, Madam Speaker. Actually, the way I interpret the Bill and the way it's drafted and the way Department of Commerce and Community Affairs actually has a \$5,000,000 limit on the extent of relief that a company could get. That would mean that any one company could file a claim, get all 5,000,000 and, therefore, nullify the Amendment to which we adopted yesterday meaning that all companies that exist in the State of Illinois that here for a number of years and, therefore, would require or at least be qualified for some relief on SC or UI would get some relief. Actually, the way the Bill is drawn in its narrow perspective, it could mean that that one company could get all the relief. Now, beyond that there's another reason why you should defeat the Bill in my And that is, if you want to do something for jobs, to create jobs and to retain jobs in the State of Illinois, it's not this method that's a good example of how we could

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

help the economic situation in the state. Шe have aп opportunity to correct the statute in the areas of workmens' comp and unemployment comp. Let me cite you just a couple of good examples and have been the subject of mine for a number of years, and that is to give some relief for preexisting injury credit and also address the problem on permanent partial relating to minor scars and the awards that are granted because of a small scar that an employee has on his hand or his finger or even I think that that's a better way to address the his leq. problem rather than this piecemeal approach. And I would urge the Assembly to defeat the Bill." therefore, Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bonan, for what reason VOII

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bonan, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ronan: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like Representative Tuerk, if he has got an idea to... to change public policy here in the State of Illinois, well why doesn't he bring his ideas before the Labor and Commerce Committee? We both serve on it. We know it's a fair and objective Committee that evaluates his proposals. If he's got a..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan, you'll have time to make that remark in closing. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Friedrich: "Representative Ronan, I'm a little disappointed that you have set the figure of 100. I think statistics show that more people in Illinois are employed in groups of less than 100 then they are over 100. Why would you cut the deadline at 100? I'd like to have 100 industries employ 75 a piece?"

Ronan: "Well, Representative Friedrich, that would have been an interesting idea, and if you would have presented that as

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

an Amendment, I would have discussed it with the Senate Sponsor, and possibly you could have achieved something.

The Bill came over with... at the level that the Senate Sponsor said. I thought it was a reasonable level."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
Mays: "Would the Gentleman yield for a couple questions?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Mays: "Mr. Ronan, would you please explain the rational for this

Bill in the first place? I might have missed part of it as
you were going."

Ronan: "Well, Representative Mays, let me try to bring you up-to-snuff. What I'm trying to do here is to aid business in the State of Illinois. It's typical of the Democratic Party; that we're the party that works for job production. We're the party that works to establish new businesses in Illinois. We're basically the party of the creative ideas. And this is just a creative idea to aid business here in the State of Illinois."

Mays: "And how would this aid business?"

Ronan: "By giving an incentive to businesses that are going to employ 100 or more people that we will cut 50 percent of their unemployment and workers' comp insurance costs for manufacturing corporations."

Mays: "So, this would then aid business. Obviously, then unemployment insurance and workers' comp in your mind are a problem in this state then, is that not correct?"

Ronan: "Absolutely. Not in the capacity that obviously we've established safeguards for employees and people who work in this state. I think we have an obligation in State Government to protect the worker. I think that when we have flawed federal policies that we've seen in the last five years coming out of Washington, which has cost us manufacturing jobs, we've got federal policy that's based

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

on punishing the midwest and northeast at the expense the sunbelt, I think we have to establish new initiatives here in the State of Illinois. As you're aware, the Reagan Policy doesn't work. It's been documented time again that... that the President is way off base. You know. we've qot unemployment rising in the State of Illinois, which shows a flawed economic policy, but we're not going to sit back. We in the General Assembly will work together in a bipartisan manner to do something about creating jobs here in the State of Illinois. And I'm happy to see that you voted for the Amendment yesterday. look forward for your support on the Bill today."

Mays: "I really don't want to interrupt the response ever from you because it's enlightening to the whole Body on whatever the topic might be, but back to the point. You believe that we've got to aid business in this state, and a big portion of that obviously from this Bill is trying to address the cost of workers' comp and unemployment insurance in this state, is that not correct?"

Ronan: "Yes, Representative Mays, what we're trying to do is establish a concept here in the State of Illinois. We in the Democratic Party believe that you have to protect the rights of the worker, and that's why we have a workers' comp system that's... that's doing a pretty adequate job. And as you and I both are well aware, our worker comp rates really kind of put us in the middle of all the states here in this country. We're not overly excessive in our grants, and we really don't deny adequate claims. So, you know, we want a fair and equitable workers' comp system."

Mays: "If we give this..."

Ronan: "Let's talk about... Representative Mays, I'd like to finish. Let's talk about an unemployment problem we've got here in the State of Illinois, over 9 percent unemployment.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

That's because we've got flawed federal policies that we're burdened to live under. With that situation, I'm trying to protect the worker who's injured. And with trying to try to protect workers who have been laid off because of no fault of their own, we have those two fine systems. Now we're coming in with a new idea to try to create more jobs here in the State of Illinois in the manufacturing area. That's what this Bill is all about. That's why I was happy to sponsor it after the Senate sent it over, and that's what we're trying to accomplish."

Mays: "So, you're trying to address the problem of workers' compensation costs and unemployment insurance costs in this state to make us more attractive to possible expansion of business in this state, is that not correct?"

Ronan: as you're well aware, Representative Mays, we've worked, at least in my four terms here in the General Assembly, to address the issues of unemployment insurance and workers' comp. We've had an agreed Bill process that's finally working to try to put a cap on some of our unemployment insurance problems. You're aware of that. I'm aware of that. There was an agreed to process between management and labor. It went a long way. It's not our fault though that the unemployment keeps climbing here in the State of Illinois. That's a real tragedy, and we have to address that also."

Mays: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Mays: "I am extremely pleased to see the Gentleman aware of the problems of workers' comp and unemployment insurance in this state and trying to come up with solutions to address that problem. I, however, have reservations with the type of solution that he has proposed in this Bill. I don't believe that a \$5,000,000 appropriation has even been

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

approved by the Appropriations Committee for a purpose like I don't know that a \$5,000,000 appropriation is qoing to even make a dent in the area of workers comp and insurance perceptionate wise, let alone reality wise, for the manufacturing sector that this Bill seek to attract. I would believe that the fair and the reasonable way to do it that it would apply to all classes of business, both before 1976 and since, small and large, expanding businesses as well as new businesses, would be to go back and work over the workers comp and unemployment insurance laws. utilizing that agreed Bill Т don't know that this is one of those agreed process. Bills, by the way. And for that reason I would oppose this Bill. I simply believe that this is the ... not the correct way to do this. I think what we're doing is basically approaching a state fund concept, and if... and that kind of concept has been around a long time and rejected many different times. Por those reasons, I would oppose this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,
Representative Ronan, to close. Quickly."

Ronan: "I move for the passage of Senate Bill 320."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 320 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Braun adds her 'aye' vote. There are, therefore, 67 voting 'aye'. Representative Dunn wants to vote 'aye' also. There are therefore 68 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Bill 404, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 404, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of
the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This legislation was very similar to House Bill 257, in fact, identical which basically raises the threshold in which an employer must submit to the Department of Revenue the income tax withheld from 500 to 1,000 dollars. There was no opposition in Committee, and there was none that I know of at... at this point in time. Senate Amendment #1 put the effective date at January 1st of '86. Supported, as well, by the Department of Revenue, and I ask for passage of Senate Bill 404."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage Senate Bill 404. And on that guestion is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 404 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. leave of the Body, we'll go back now to Senate Bill 39 at the top of your Calendar, Representative Younge. read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act creating the East

  St. Louis Development Authority. Third Reading of the
  Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Bill is on Second Reading. According to our Calendar, it's been held on Second Reading. Would you

- 58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985 read the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act creating the East
  St. Louis Development Authority. Second Reading of the
  Bill. Amendment #1, Wyvetter Younge, amends Senate Bill
  39."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed or Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Wyvetter Younge, amends Senate Bill 39."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Wyvetter Younge, amends Senate
  Bill..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #2. Basically it corrects errors in the Bill. As for example, the condemnation powers were taken out at one place and not at another. And I move..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 39. And on that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Lady would yield for questions?"
- Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."
- Vinson: "Representative, does the Amendment do anything other than eliminate condemnation powers?"
- Younge: "Yes, the Amendment makes several corrections in the Bill. For example, it deletes a ten miles limit in which the various municipalities can execute or exercise municipal powers and makes the territorial frame of reference three miles, rather than ten miles. Also, it takes out the requirement that a contractor who is engaging

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

in demolition would be... would have to put up one third of the bond, or an upper limit or \$25,000. I felt that that was unreasonable, and so I've taken that out too. But basically those are the changes that are made."

Vinson: "Okay. Now, the language in the Amendment on page two,
lines nine and ten. What's the purpose for that?"

Younge: "On page two..."

Vinson: "Lines nine and ten."

Younge: "On page two, lines nine and ten, it says, 'the General Assembly finds that the health, welfare, morals and safety of its citizens require the encouragement of well planned diversified and economically sound community development."

Vinson: "No. No. I'm talking... on page two of the Amendment, lines nine and ten, on page two of the Amendment. That language would appear to delete language in the Bill that says this Act is not a limit upon any home rule unit."

Younge: "The... on page two on lines nine and ten refer to page

19 of the Bill. Just let me look at that."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I'm talking about the... line 11 on page 21 by deleting lines one and two."

Younge: "On page 21 by deleting lines one and two this Act is not a limit upon any home rule unit. This... these lines had no effect or no force of the Bill. So, they were just taken out. There is no... nothing in the Bill that limits the home rule units power."

Vinson: "So, you're saying that the Bill will not operate as a limit on home rule even though you're deleting that language?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 39 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Younge now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill Third Reading... Senate Bill 33 on Third Reading, are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act to creating the

  East St. Louis Development Authority. Third Reading of
  the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 39 is the same as House Bill 49, which has already passed the House and gone to the Senate. It would create the East St. Louis Development Authority and much needed development too for my area. Several municipalities around the East St. Louis area wish to join together to come up with a long range economic development plan in order to raise the per capita income and improve the quality of life, and I ask your approval of this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 39. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 39 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"

Vinson: "To explain my vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Explain your vote."

Vinson: "To point out that this is the Bill which would authorize more than a trillion dollars in spending."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye',
49 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Senate Bill 561, Representative Wolf.
Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 561, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 561 amends the Capital Development Board Bond Act insofar as it pertains to port districts. What it does, it changes the Act's current provisions which require districts to repay to the state from an amount equal to 20 percent of gross receipts attributable to facilities financed by the state to an amount which is not more than 20 percent of gross receipts, but not less than 20 percent of the facilities' profits. The exact amount of that payback provision would be jointly determined by a meeting between the district and the Capital Development Board. Originally there was language on page two of the Bill dealing with another subject which was questioned by the Committee at the time, and through an agreement, that language was striken from the Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

"The Gentleman has moved for the passage Speaker Breslin: of Senate Bill 561. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 561 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 748, Representative Mays. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 748, a Bill for an Act in relationship
to retail servicemen and suppliers maintenance...
maintaining of place of business in Illinois. Third
Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 748 is identical to House Bill 313, which Representative Mautino and I sponsored. We are the Sponsors on this Bill also. And what this does is attempt to correct some sales tax inequities on our border states. We've worked with the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association; and, before that for about two years, with the Legislative Investigating Commission on this thing. And we think we got a pretty good Bill. I would move for its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 748. And on that question is there any discussion? Representative Mays, we don't believe that there is a problem with this Bill, however, House Democratic Staff would like to have time to look it over. Would you mind taking it out of the record to give them some time to do that?"

Mays: "That'd be very fine."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Thank you. Out of the record. Senate
Bill 847, Representative Saltsman. Representative
Saltsman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 847, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment..."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 302,

Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 902, a Bill for an Act to amend the

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 915,

  Representative Bichmond. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 915, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Illinois Farm Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 915 amends the Illinois Farm Development Authority Act and deletes an obsolete reference to Farmers' Home Administration insurance, and allows the Authority Board members to receive compensation. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage οf Senate Bill 915. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is. 'Shall Senate Bill 915 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted is final action. who wish? The Clerk will take the record. there are 107 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', none question, voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1029, Representative McNamara. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1029, a Bill for an Act in relationship to enterprise zones. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. What this Bill does is effectively changes the method of collecting the taxes or noncollecting of the taxes for machinery and... or excuse me... for retailers... incentives for building materials for those people building in an enterprise zone.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Previously what has happened is. is that the person building would pay the tax, it would collected by the Department of Revenue then apply for a refund. The Department of Revenue is streamlines the process. totally in agreement with it. Amendment #1 is an agreement with the Department of Revenue. It allows them to take look at how much tax is being... there. and also to continue on with... with a simpler process."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1029. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question 'Shall Senate Bill 1029 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will On this question, there are 116 voting take the record. 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1129, Representative Braun. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1129, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young."
- Young: "Madam Speaker, with leave of the Body I'd like to move this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
  the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
  Amendment, are there any objections? Hearing no
  objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on
  Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill \$129, which amends the Civil
  Administrative Code of Illinois. Amendment #2, Anthony

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Young, amends Senate Bill 1129."

- Young: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 was drafted by DCCA to remove their opposition from the Bill. What it does is it deletes the requirement to create a board, and it keeps the actual program which will loan to minority and female small businesses."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1129. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1129 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The Gentleman now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1129 on Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on... excuse me, Representative Vinson, do you have an objection?"
- Vinson: "I think that they can be adequately handled by questions on Third Reading. I just... just want to ask the Sponsor some questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, read the Bill on Third Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1129, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young."
- Young: "Okay. Senate Bill 1129 as amended will create the Minority Controlled and Female Controlled Business Loan Program. And what the Program will do is it will loan money to minority and female controlled businesses. It

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

will operate initially on a trial basis in the City of Chicago, East St. Louis, and in Alexander or Pulaski County. The funds will be administered through DCCA, who with the adoption of Amendment #2 has no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1129. And on that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative, after the adoption of the... I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question, Madam Speaker?" Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Vinson: "Representative, after the adoption of the Amendment,
does the Bill still provide for direct grants and low
interest loans to minority owned firms?"

Young: "Yes, it does."

Vinson: "And throughout the State of Illinois?"

Young: "This particular Bill is limited to the City of Chicago, the City of East St. Louis, and Alexander or Pulaski County."

Vinson: "Alexander or Pulaski County."

Young: "Excuse me, Representative, those are the three places where there will be an office for the purpose of administering these loans. These loans will be available for minority and female businesses throughout the state."

Vinson: "What language in the Bill says that the loans can be made throughout the state?"

Young: "You are correct, Representative, it is limited to those three counties."

Vinson: "It is limited to those three counties."

Young: "Yes, it is."

Vinson: "Now, why is it that you make the board choose between Alexander and Pulaski County? Why can't they do both

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Alexander and Pulaski County?"

- Young: "I think originally the Bill was drafted to go statewide, but there was opposition to that at least initially. So, on a trial basis it will be in three locations."
- Vinson: "Yes, but why do they have to choose between Alexander and Pulaski County? Why not both Alexander and Pulaski?"
- Young: "Because both... Those are the counties with the greatest needs, the three counties mentioned in the Bill throughout the state."
- Vinson: "Yes, but I... the way this board operates it has to choose whether it's going to make those loans in Alexander County or Pulaski County. It can't do it in both Alexander and Pulaski. I don't understand that. That seems a little bit unfair to me."
- Young: "I'd be... I'd be happy to make it both counties,

  Representative. I'd be happy to make it statewide."
- Vinson: "Well, do you want to hold the... take the Bill back to

  Second Reading and put an Amendment on to do that?"
- Young: "No, I think the Governor could easily make that 'or' an 'and' with an amendatory veto as he signs the Bill."
- Vinson: "Oh, no. The Speaker wouldn't permit that. He'd think that'd be going too far with an amendatory veto, wouldn't he?"

Young: "I think in this situation he'd be agreeable."

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Under the terms of this Bill, the state would engage in a process of making grants and loans to minority firms and female loan firms, and that might be a valid, laudable concept. It might be appropriate that for black capitalism, or hispanic capitalism, or female capitalism purposes we ought to do that. And it may be that our view of this issue is such that because of discrimination in the

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

because of inadequate opportunities in the past past and Hispanics, and blacks, and women should qet preferential treatment from the state to try to move them into the work force, to try to move them into the the entrepreneurial class. That is a concept which is certainly merit... meritorious of our attention. and our debate, and our concern. I don't know how I'd come down on that, but I can understand that that's valid. This Bill totally ignores blacks, Bill doesn't do that. and Hispanics, and women in Peoria. It totally ignores blacks. and hispanics. and women in Champaign. totally ignores blacks. and Hispanics, and women in Decatur. and blacks, and Hispanics, and women in Aurora. and Rockford, and the Quad Cities area, and Springfield. ignored and left out by this Bill. This is a vote for discrimination. If you vote for this Bill. vou're voting to discriminate against blacks and Hispanics and women throughout the State of Illinois unless they live in Chicago or East St. Louis and Pulaski or Alexander County. the worst evil this Bill does is to put the onus on a specific board to have to sit and decide whether and Hispanics, and women in either Alexander or Pulaski County are to get the benefits of this opportunity. They can't choose both Pulaski and Alexander County. They got to choose between Alexander and Pulaski County. It's a little bit like holding a criminal trial where there are two defendents, and you're going to give out the penalty, and you're required to give the death penalty to one or the other, but you can't give it to both. It's just an awful idea. It's an idea that is more replete with and discrimination, and class hatred than anything racism, we've seen yet. I would certainly urge a 'no' vote for this attempt to return to the back of the bus."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman... the Lady from Cook,
Representative Braun, on the question."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Sam Vinson's vassal intelligence gives him the ability to take humor and use it as a subterfuge for spiritedness. Now. this is an important Bill. ጥክል Amendment to which he refers that limits the application of the Bill was the Governor's own Amendment. the Governor's Office Amendment. We originally drafted the Bill to make it apply statewide so that the ills that talked about in the early parts of his remarks could be addressed consistently throughout the state. However. objections were raised so that the Bill would be limited in applicability so that DCCA could actually manage the parameters of the program. It was made into Ιt was severely limited by the Amendment, that again, was not drafted by the Sponsors, but came out of the Governor's own administration. Now, if indeed we are to begin to be serious about helping the development of business economies within these respective communities that so badly need them, if we're going to have an to public aid, if we're going to have an alternative to the if we're going to have an alternative to destitution where people are not able to have jobs in their own community, then we will continue to treat lightly this subject. I've been in this General Assembly for a little while now, and I've seen subsidies come gasohol, for farm implements. Today you got a memo on the unitary tax revenue refund and all the millions of dollars that went to that. It's not asking a whole lot to put some money into these communities where it will do the most good to help create some employment for people. And that's all that this Bill seeks to do, to provide some jobs for people

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

who need them. I would encourage your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, again have heard from the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle, his usual kind of rhetoric which he hopes will divide the support for a good idea. I think that it would be nice, yes, if it were a statewide program. But I also feel that if we get the program started, and if we see that help minority people and women to be able to does establish new business enterprises and to make a go areas of the state that the Bill now applies to. these that perhaps the Governor and his agencies will and decide that it is effective and will be happy to And so, in order have it extended statewide. to qet in the door and to provide the information that seems to be lacking on the other side of the aisle in regard the benefit of helping those who have not been able to make it on their own in the past, I thoroughly support this Bill and hope that it will be the predecessor to one that can be applied statewide in the future."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Priedrich."

Priedrich: "Madam Speaker, I have a real problem with this. I've spent about a year getting a female Eskimo in my district approved as a minority contractor. And I want to tell you that's about as narrow minority as you can get in southern Illinois. And I don't want to have to see her move to St. Louis... East St. Louis."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn has moved the previous

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Young to close."

Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In closing, I would just like to address colleagues, especially those on the Republican side of the aisle, to the comments made by Representative Vinson. think the most important comments he made was that he recognized the need for business assistance to blacks. Hispanics. and women. He recognized that discrimination place in the past. has taken And he recognized to alleviate that past discrimination these groups may need a little extra assistance. I certainly would agree that the program would... should be run statewide, but to come to agreement with the Governor's Office, who wants to make sure that the program is actually effective and working before we invest statewide funds, we want to work the program in these three counties so we can have effective, workable programs to alleviate some of the affects of discrimination and help small black, Hispanic, and women businesses create more jobs and help improve the economy of the State of Illinois. And I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1129 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Representative Hicks is recognized for one minute to explain his vote."

Hicks: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, we have a perfect example here that in the retail market we call it bait and switch. You know the opponents of the Bill said, 'We don't want this statewide, but if you'll just narrow this down to just reflect a few

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

counties, then it will be a Bill that will probably fly out of here. And suddenly now they've switched their sides. The typical bait and switch. They baited them. They took the bait, and now they're going to switch and say, 'Hey now look what you're doing to everybody else statewide. You're not giving them a chance.' I urge your 'aye' vote on this. Don't fall for the scheme."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."

McCracken: "I take exception of the previous speaker's remarks. I don't know who he's referring to as having engaged in the bait and switch. And this reference to the Governor's Office should not be confused with the Republican side of the aisle of the General Assembly. Amendment #1 change the scope of the Bill. Amendment #2 didn\*t change the scope of the Bill. The Bill was originally written with the scope limited to Alexander and those other counties. It was never a statewide Bill. It was never position of ours to argue that it should be statewide. There is no bait and switch. It was a bad idea when it was first written, and the Amendments don't make it any better. It is de jure discrimination when in fact he's trying to respond to de facto discrimination. So, discrimination is a matter of law is no better than de facto discrimination." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Representative Saline, Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to rise to say that I'm proud to associate myself with such a concept, and I think there's some misunderstanding from the other side of the aisle. The fact that... I think this should be viewed as a pilot project, and we'd be proud to see other counties who follow in the near future with this type of philosophy. The points and the locations of this state in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

which this Bill addresses the problems, I think, clearly indicates a fair effort to try to get the very southern most tip, the central part, and the northern part where also the unemployment figures are in the 20 percent and over. And I dare say there is very many places in the state that would compete with Alexander or Pulaski. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'ave'. 38 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Senate Bill 1364, Representative Mays. passed. read the Bill. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen. we have several announcements. The first is, that we are planning to work until10:00 tonight. That's the bad news. The good news is that the Speaker's Office and the Minority Leader's Office are providing supper this evening. It will be chicken, and it will be around 7:00 or so. Okay. 6:30. We'll make it as early as possible. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"

Vinson: "I just respectfully request that we get Popeye's chicken so it will be spicy."

Speaker Breslin: "I'll see what T can do about that. Representative Stephens on this question. Just a moment announcement. The second announcement is that in order to save time, we are going to skip over all Consent Calendar Bills that appear on the Order of ... that appear on Special Orders. We are moving very slowly, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are averaging four Bills and hour. So, for that reason we have made that decision. Representative Leverenz on that issue. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Inquiry of the Chair. Why don't we just pass the Consent Calendar?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "We may do that as soon as everybody has had time to read the Consent Calendar. The last thing that we would like to discuss... Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Well, if you have further announcements I'll wait..."

Speaker Breslin: "No. proceed."

Stephens: "In order to speed things along I had removed earlier Senate Bill 891 from the Consent Calendar for purpose of an Amendment, which just made an effective date. And I would ask leave of the House to return Senate Bill 891 to the Consent Calendar Order of Third Reading. I've checked with your..."

Speaker Breslin: "What Order of Business is that on?"

Stephens: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Breslin: "It's on the Consent Calendar now?"

Stephens: "No, it's on... it was removed to Second Reading. The
Amendment was placed and it... Third Short Debate. And I'm
requesting consent. I've checked with your side of the
aisle, and they've agreed."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked leave so that Senate Bill 891 can be placed on... back on the Consent Calendar, First Legislative Day. Are there any objections? On this Bill? Are there any objections to this Motion? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave, and Senate Bill 891 will now appear on the Order of Consent Calendar Third Reading, First Legislative Day. Representative Hannig, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. While we're on that Order of Business, yesterday I had Senate Bill 212 removed from the Consent Calendar. It now appears on page 15 of our Calendar. There was an Amendment put on this morning by Representative Ryder, which simply put an effective date on that Bill. And I would ask now that it could also be

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

returned to the Order of Consent."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig has moved that Senate Bi11 212 be placed on the Order of the Consent Calendar Third Reading, First Legislative Day. Does the Gentleman leave? .Hearing nо objections. the Gentleman has And Senate Bill 212 will appear on the Order Consent Calendar First Legislative Day. Now, on the same Order of Business. Ladies and Gentlemen. Business and Economic Development, we have five Bills that have been requested to be added to the Roll Call... or added to Order of Business. We have checked with both sides of the aisle, and Leadership on both sides have agreed that Senate Bill 158, 906, 1156, 1402 and 1404 will be heard on Order of Call. So. with leave of the Body we will now consider Senate Bill 158. Representative Klemm's Clerk, read the Bill. Is it a Consent Calendar Bill? It's on page 33 of the Calendar"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Klemm, that Bill is on the Consent Calendar. It has been objected to and is not on the Consent Calendar, is that correct, Mr. Klemm?

Okay. Proceed, Mr. Klemm."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 159, a Bill for an Act to provide for the organization and operation of county historical museum districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 158 creates the County Historical Museum District Act, and provides for a front door referendum if the voters in a particular county wish to create a county historical museum. We have the current law in Illinois that allows the county boards to assist in some of the museum organizations and groups. However, many

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

counties fail to levy this tax, because they're obviously trying to be consistent and cognizant of the needs of the voters. But in some counties, the voters wish the county board to support and try to promote the historical museums that they have in their district. So, it was felt that if the voters decided they wished to create this tax upon themselves by petition and by a direct vote, that they should be allowed to create this particular district. The Bill was fully debated in the Senate and in the various Committees, and there was no known opposition at that time. There's none that I'm aware of, and I do ask for your consideration and adoption."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm, because the Bill was taken off the Consent Calendar the Bill went back to Second Reading Second Legislative Day. So, the Bill has to be read a second time on Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 158, a Bill for an Act to provide for the organization and operation of the country historical museum districts. Second Reading of the Bill. Together with Senate Amendment... I mean, together with House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed or Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions or further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

  Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 158, a Bill for an Act to provide for
  the organization and operation of county historical museum
  districts. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm has already presented his Bill on Third Reading. Is there any discussion of that Bill, Senate Bill 158? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 158 pass?' All those in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative DeJaegher. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 906, Representative Hoffman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 906, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Illinois Farm Equipment Fair Dealership

Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was sponsored in the Senate by Senator Fawell. It came out of the Committee on pass', and it's my understanding that that 1 do individual is now not in opposition to the legislation. What this does is provide that dealers of construction equipment are treated the same way as farm equipment... equipment dealerships are under the Farm Equipment Fair Dealership Law. This has to do that their relationships with producers of the equipment that they're distributing. It's my understanding that there is no opposition to the legislation, and in fact, it passed the Senate on the agreed Bill list. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 906. And on that question, the Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

McPike: "Can you tell me the practical affect of the Bill?"

Hoffman: "The practical affect of the Bill provides that construction and industrial equipment wholesalers, manufacturers and distributors shall repurchase such

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

equipment previously purchased and held by the retailer if they cancel their... their dealership. The repurchase shall be at a 100 percent of the net cost of the new, unsold, or undamaged income, and complete construction and industrial equipment and 85 percent of new, unused, and damaged repair parts. These are the same provisions that presently apply for farm equipment."

McPike: "Construction and industrial equipment is not defined in the Bill. Does it have to be?"

Hoffman: "No, it does not. It's like farm equipment. It's the same generic term..."

McPike: "Okay."

Hoffman: "... understood in the business."

McPike: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Keane: "Does this extend the tax benefits?"

Hoffman: "No, it does not."

Keane: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 906 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1156, Representative Braun. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1156, a Bill for an Act in relationship to job training and amending certain Acts herein named.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There's an error. This is not the one that I had asked to have on the Special Order."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Senate Bill 1402, Representative Braun, page 13 on your Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act to provide for vocational and professional enterprise training centers. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you very much. Senate Bill 1402 creates the Vocational Enterprise Training Act. Essentially what it does is set up a demonstration vocational and professional centers for the development of business skills and incentives in depressed areas. I'm... I'd like to answer any questions you have. The Bill passed the Senate. I'm sorry. I don't have that."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1402. And on that question, the Gentleman... the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Braun: "There was... Madam Speaker..."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

- Braun: "There are two Amendments to this Bill. I'm sorry. If I can bring it back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. The Lady has asked leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, the Lady has leave. Read the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act to provide for vocational and professional enterprise training centers.

  Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed or Floor
  Amendments?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was withdrawn. Amendment #2 was tabled. No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It was my understanding that
Representative Washington had an Amendment, and there was
an Amendment filed for Representative Cowlishaw earlier
this afternoon. If there not... the Clerk doesn't have
them, then obviously we can't go forward with the Bill at
this time."

Speaker Breslin: "We have nothing on file, Representative Braun.

Perhaps you would like to take the Bill out of the record,

and we will be coming back to other Bills."

Braun: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Senate Bill 1404, Representative Braun.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1404, a Bill for an Act creating the
Illinois Job Development Corp. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This one will work for real, okay? 1404 creates the Illinois Job Development Corp within DCCA to provide young residents' training in rural and urban work skills through employment activities in both the public and private sector. I would answer any questions regarding the specifics of the legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1404. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1404 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State and Local Government Administration appears Senate Bill 14, Representative Bullock. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act..."

- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we can't guarantee that we're going to get back to these Bills, so be prepared. The next Bill is Senate Bill 98, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 98, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "This Bill was passed from Second to Third today. The Lady asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 98. Is there leave? Hearing no objection, the Lady has leave. The Bill has already been read on Third. Proceed, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Senate Bill 98 does two things. First of all, it defines who might use the designation medical doctor after his or her name in conformance with agreements between the Department of Registration and Education, the Medical Society and the institutions which prepare people for the Medical Doctor Degree. And. secondly, it broadens the of approved doctoral programs in psychology so as to make it possible for people to sit for the psychology exam given by the Department of Registration and Education without having to go through a long approval process. also increases the membership of the Psychology Committee and authorizes the Director of the Department hearing officers in disciplinary proceedings under the adjudication of these kinds of cases. Deletes some obsolete language. I would be happy to answer any of questions, and I would appreciate your support."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 98. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 98 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 120, Representative Kulas. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. Out of the record. Clerk, read Bill. Senate Bill 120."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 120, a Bill for an Act to make the birthday of Casimir Pulaski a banking holiday and school holiday. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 120 designates the first Monday in March as a banking holiday and a school holiday as the birthday of the great Polish Revolutionary War hero, Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski. According to the great historian, 'Rulari', never was there a warrior who possessed greater dexterity in every kind of service than Casimir Pulaski. Benjamin Franklin, in introducing him to General Washington, writes, 'Count Pulaski, who was a General in Poland and who is to join you, is esteemed in Europe as one of the greatest officers in Europe'. Perhaps no greater insight into the sturdy character of the illustrious Pulaski, known and revered in both Europe and America. could be given than to hear the man state to the Continental Congress, in his own words he said, 'I could not submit to stoop before the soverance of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America and

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free and of settling as a citizen to fight for liberty. General Pulaski landed in America in the middle of July of (sic - 1777). After presenting his letters to he waited for Congress to take Washington and Congress, action. But restless and eager to aid our cause for freedom, he did not wait for official cognizance. Count Pulaski struck his first blow for American independence at the Battle of Brandywine on September 11, 1777. Four days after this event, he was appointed by Congress to the command of the Cavalry with the rank of Brigadier General. At the Battle of Savannah, Georgia he succumbed to wounds: on October 11, 1779, he died at the age of 31 years and, old. Pulaski died as he had lived, a noble and warrior fighting the battle of liberty and of the Republic. He sacrificed himself, all the years of his young life, his fortune, his ancestorial dignity, his lofty spirit, his splendid genious and all his earthly hopes for liberty, justice and humanity. For these things he gave all he had, his martyred life. I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to qive me your affirmative vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 120. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have great respect for the House Sponsor of this ... of this legislation. I would ask you to look at this very closely, because what it does, in fact, is require that banks and schools be closed on the first Monday in March in commemoration of Casimir Pulaski, who is a... identified as a Polish patriarch and is someone who made a contribution to... to the Revolution. Now, it is presently a commemorative holiday. In the year that

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

ve're talking about educational reform. ful1 day kindergarten, preschool, testing, required remediation young people who need additional help during the summer, it particularly inappropriate to say we should close school another day. We already have too many holidays. as the schools are concerned and to set up another day to close just doesn't make any sense. And if you want share with the young people the significance of the contribution made by this gentleman, then it would seem appropriate to spend the time in school and to take some time and to point out the significance of this individual and the role that ... that he played. It just doesn't seem appropriate, in the light of what we're trying to do this Session, and that is to provide for excellence education. And for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, of the House and with all due respect to the House Sponsors of this legislation, I think it would be inappropriate for us to pass this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. it's rare that we have such an opportunity to vote on this type of legislation: that the ethnic community the State of Illinois, of which of Slovic descent, there is one commemorative holiday for any Slovic individual in the State of Illinois. Although this is a commemorative holiday. Casimir Pulaski has been a symbol of courage and that brought freedom to the United States of America. And I would think that it would benefit everybody in the House to support this type of legislation to give us some type of heritage and we could have a day to recognize one of our true heroes in the United States, and that's Casimir Pulaski. And I would urge everyone to support Senate Bill

58th Legislative Day

oppose it."

June 20, 1985

120. "

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson." Didrickson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I think Representative Hoffman put it in the most serious tone respect for the Sponsor of this legislation. but. in this year of education reform, another day eliminated from the 176 days that we mandate in the state is, going to put us in jeopardy with regards to what other surrounding states around us are even doing with regards or other countries with regards to the days in school. But on a lighter moment, I would just like to say there are a number of growing minority groups down here. We just found out that there are seven Swedes who serve the General Assembly. I think it would be appropriate that Leif Ericson Day or an 'Ole Owenson' Day, or perhaps Representative Terzich could find an appropriate Croation that we could have a day. What ... In closing, I do have respect for the Sponsor, but again, on a serious note, this isn't a good Bill at this time and I would

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... or Madam Speaker and Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this
legislation. It provides for a bank holiday. And anytime
we can provide for a bank holiday, where no savings, no
depositor loses a dime, I think we shouldn't miss a chance
to pass up that opportunity. We should support this find
legislation and tell everybody that bank holidays are not
all bad. Some of them are good. Let's vote for this
Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."
Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in
support of this fine legislation. The last holiday that we

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

recognized was Martin Luther King Day, and I feel that there have been many, many holidays extended to heroes of our nation and our country. I think it's time that Casimir Pulaski and the Polish people of Illinois receive the same recognition for all the struggles and hardships that they have faced and are still continuing facing. Let's preserve the fine name of Casimir Pulaski and the very fine heritage of the Polish people. They're very proud. They're very kind, and I think they should have a day in their honor. I move its passage."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Hr. Speaker (sic Madam Speaker) and Ladies and
  Gentlemen of the House, I would commend Representative
  Kulas for bringing this Bill before us today. I represent
  a district that has approximately 35 percent Polish voters,
  and I'm very much interested in honoring the Polish people
  of America. And I'd like to see this Bill enacted."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 120 pass?'

  Representative Kulas, to close."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I guess there never will be a good time to pass this Bill, because this Bill was before this House before unfortunately, we didn't have enough votes. T \* m willing to support a Bill for the Swedes. If they want a Leif Ericson Day, I'll support them, even though Leif Ericson didn't die for this country. I am talking about a young man who at the age of 31 gave up his native land. came to this country because he wanted to live in a free He wanted to live the American Dream. country. Ι Polish, but I came as a DP to this country when I was eight years old. We don't have any Poles in this House. I told them I'd be glad to Sponsor this Bill. Ladies and

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Gentlemen, what's one more day off for school? Nothing.

  The bankers are in favor of this Bill. The Governor said

  he'll sign this Bill. And I ask you for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 120 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who will... wish? Representative DeLeo, one minute to explain your vote. Representative DeLeo? Use the one next to you."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. It's a day we could go automobile shopping."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83... 85... 84 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate... Senate Bill 147, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 147, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Liquor Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is identical to a House Bill which we passed on the Con... Agreed List last week or a couple of weeks ago. It amends the Liquor Control Act. I would point out that also this was the subject matter of negotiations between representatives of Anhauser-Busch, distributors of wine and beer from throughout the state, and I believe it is an agreed Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 147. And on that question, is there any discussion? The question... There being no discussion, the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 147 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 176, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 176, a Bill for an Act establishing the
Community Fire Protection Grant Program. Third Reading of
the Bill."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This is the Senate

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Bill of which we had much debate last Session. Implements rural program for equipment, not taking it out of the Fire Prevention Fund, but under the State Fire Marshal's Office in the ... not from the premiums, but from the General Revenue Fund. The Program is set up at, I believe, 170,000 dollars in the appropriation: 30,000 for administration. I know ο£ opposition to DО it. Appropriation is in Senate Bill 308 to track substantive language. And I move for the passage of 176." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 176. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 176 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 291, Representative Hartke. Clerk, read the Bill. This Bill is on the Order of

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Second Reading. Read it on Second, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 291, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the regulation of rivers, lakes and streams of the State of Illinois. Has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Hartke now asks
leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 291 on
Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no
objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on
Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 291, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the regulation of rivers, lakes and streams of the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "What this Bill... Madam Speaker, Members of the House,
what this Bill is doing is exempting all existing dams in
the State of Illinois. It's been quite a.. quite a good
Bill, and I would appreciate your favorable support in this
Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 291. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

McCracken: "Representative, does the Department of Transportation have a position on this issue?"

Hartke: "They had some opposition earlier, but I don't believe
they do now."

McCracken: "Alright. To the Bill. I think that the Department does have a position on the issue, and I think it's opposed. I have, in my file, a letter dated June 13, 1985

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

where the Department states its opposition. And the opposition is concerned with safety. I understand the desire to exempt existing dams from Transportation jurisdiction and to exempt existing dams from any modifications the Department may desire, but we're talking and about safety we're talking about safety responsibility has been jurisdictionally determined already to lie with the Department of Transportation. In their two page letter, directed to Minority Leader Daniels, they make reference to the fact that some of these dams in question are as old as sixty years of age and obviously may or may not conform with modern procedures and codes and serious hazards. The Department has a good program. based on statutory powers deemed appropriate by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, by the National Association of Dam Safety Officials, the Army Corp of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation and others. I understand the concerns. understand the desire of the Sponsor. I think that But safety is a paramount issue of this Bill. The Department is the proper authority, and I respectfully ask that the Bill not be passed."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise strongly in support of this legislation. Perhaps I have a conflict of interest. I don't know. I happen to live on a lake with a man-made dam that was made within the last, I suppose, ten They say that our spillway isn't wide enough: and. in the event of about 30 inches of rain within a 12 or period, it wouldn't be big enough. hour Well, quite frankly, in the State of Illinois, we don't ordinarily get rains of that amount. For us to correct that spillway, enlarge it to what they would like, would cost us in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

neighborhood of a couple of million dollars at least, maybe more. It would completely ruin our area where I live. We do have a good dam. It is adequate, and I think that we should pass this legislation and the Department of Transportation ought to get their nose out of it. I urge a 'ves' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Ropp: "Representative, does this Bill just deal with dam construction? I mean, it doesn't deal with waterways or dredged ditches or anything of that nature?"

Hartke: "It's talking about the existing dams."

Ropp: "Just dams. Okay. I rise in support of this, too. As was previously mentioned, these dams met required standards by the state when they were constructed a number of years ago."

Hartke: "Correct."

Ropp: "And in good faith and in good judgement, they had the desire to make them safe. And it appears that someone in a bureaucratic position has been sitting around attempting to find something to do and now wants to cause some added costs on dams that have been operative and safe for many, many years. It certainly would not be wise, in my judgement, because of the added costs that would involve a lot of these small farmers, communities and districts, and I urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In listening to the other speakers on this Bill, I think what we're missing... we're missing the point on

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Bill. Ιf this particular vou look at the Digest... Digest, what the Bill is trying to do is take away and obsert all the good work that the Department has done in providing the safety in these dams. You ought to the people downstream, plus you ought to think about all the work that has been put into these dams and some these people that have these... that are close to these dams that the state has made put the safety provisions there eventually sell the land and take off. Some of these people that come by and buy the property expect to have the safety and the protection that they rightfully deserve. So, if you take a good look at this analysis in the and the Bill itself, what they're trying to do is protect the citizens of the State of Illinois, and they're this Department going the way it's supposed to be and protect it and give the ... give the people the right to have that property and those dams protected. And I would urge that this Bill be defeated."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I think one of the important elements that have been overlooked is that we're talking about dams that in good repair. I certainly understand why the Department of Transportation would be concerned about dams that leaking or are possibly being breached or are causing safety hazards for those who live below the spillways. we're not talking about that situation. We're talking about dams that were built in conformance with IDOT in other regulations at the time and that have been continually kept in good repair. And I think that's the key difference, and I stand in support of the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Saltsman."

- Saltsman: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Hartke, to close."
- Hartke: "Madam Speaker, we've heard the discussion. I'd just urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 291 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative
  Countryman, one minute to explain your vote."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It looks like it's going well, and I urge its passage. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Keane... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, one minute to explain your vote."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think a vote 'no' is a vote for the safety and for those people who are down river or down below that live... either live or have land below the dams. We'll have... we've had some very, very serious accidents with earthen dams in this country. If we don't continue our dam maintenance that's a nice term we will be in trouble."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman..."
- Keane: "Final comment. Final comment is is that we have to... I
  think we have to be safe. We have to think of the safety
  of children and the people who use or live around dams, and
  we have to protect the public against developers who will
  put in inferior or maintain inferior dams."
- Speaker Breslin: "Senate... The Gentleman from Edgar,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Representative Woodyard, one minute to explain your vote."
  Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had wanted to ask the
  Sponsor a question. Could you nod your head? This, in no
  way, effects drainage districts, correct? Is the Farm
  Bureau supportive of this Bill, or do you know? Thank
  you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received ... This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 312, Representative Oblinger. This Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Second."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Reform Act."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. It has been moved to Third,
  Representative Oblinger."
- Clerk Leone: "Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "It's been read on Third. Representative
  Oblinger can present the Bill on Third."
- Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment to this Bill has become the Bill. It was originally House Bill 1260, sponsored by Representative Bullock. hoping he would be present on the floor to explain it, because it is his Bill. However, it allows... this has with the Sunset Act. It allows the four Leaders of the House and the Senate to decide which agencies will reviewed each year, and it also requires the Auditor General to conduct a performance audit of all government agencies under review. And it repeals the Regulatory Reform Act of 1979."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 312. And on that question, the Gentleman from

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Kendall, Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Oblinger: "I'll try to answer the question, Representative."

Hastert: "Yeah, I understand the predicament you're in. I do have a question. You know, we've been working... Does this Bill still automatically repeal all the repealers?"

Oblinger: "Delete automatic repealers."

Hastert: "This does. Just to state agencies or to Acts?"

Oblinger: "It deletes the automatic repealers of the Licensing  $$\operatorname{\mathtt{Acts}}_{\:\raisebox{1pt}{\text{\circle*{1.5}}}}$$ 

Hastert: "Of what?"

Oblinger: "The Licensing Acts."

Hastert: "Okay. So it... For instance, like the Public Utility

Act that has a repealer of January... or December 31 of

this year, is that automatically repealed?"

Oblinger: "According to this Amendment and the analysis I have, it would. That's why I wanted Representative Bullock here.

Our analysis said it would."

Hastert: "I would really like to have you take this out of the record untilwe get a definitive answer. Let me explain why. You know, we've been working for eighteen months to redo the Public Utility Act, and we're at a point to make some movement. And, you know, if somebody is slipping something through that repeals the repeal, then, you know..."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker, would you take this out of the record untill can see if I can find Representative Bullock?"

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate..."

Oblinger: "And I will ... "

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 375,
Representative Christensen. Clerk, read the Bill. Read
the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 375... Senate Bill 375, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 375 takes out some original language that shouldn't have been in the Bill to start with. It deletes, after the word 'alcohol', 'derived solely from the use of flavoring extracts'. It doesn't change the alcohol content in the Bill at all. This Bill passed out 55 to nothing in the Senate, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 375. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question 'Shall Senate Bill 375 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Homer. The Clerk will record. On this question there are 104 voting 'ave', 5 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 397, Representative Klemm. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 397, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning fees and salaries. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Klemm, amends Senate Bill 397."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 adds a technical insert in that the prosecution would be... have to be tried before a Circuit or Associate Judge. This meets with the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

concern that the Judiciary Committee had pointed to my attention. And I do move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative... The Gentleman has moved for the passage ... the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 397. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill...' 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 397 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to waive the appropriate rule and hear House... Senate Bill 397 on Third Reading immediately"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to waive the appropriate rule to hear Senate Bill 397 immediately on Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Bill may be heard on Third Reading. Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 397, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 397 tries to amend and correct an inequity that's occurred in Illinois law. If a motor vehicle and a motorist were to violate an Illinois Vehicle Code and is picked up and cited for that violation and is tried by the state's attorneys' office, if found guilty and convicted, the state's attorney would receive a ten dollar prosecution fee that helps pay for the cost of the... operating the office and the courts. If that same motorist

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

were, in fact, to be going through a municipality and were cited for the same offense and a municipal council were to prosecute that individual, that person would not have to pay a ten dollar prosecution fee. The inequity occurs because of the discrepency that if you're charged a speeding violation in a county versus a municipality, you don't have the same fee structure. It seems that as long as municipalities are given the authority by the state's attorney on written agreement to prosecute these, that that added responsibility they should be given the financial consideration. So what we tried to do in Senate Bill 397 is to allow the municipalities who must have that responsibility to prosecute to at least be in equity with the state's attorneys so that that extra cost isn't by the taxpayers of the municipality."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 397. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

O'Connell: "Representative Klemm, this Bill was a House version
we had discussed, and I support the Bill, but I do have a
question with regards to the significance of imposing the
fee, if you plea bargain or you do not go to trial. Is the
defendant required to pay if you do not go to trial?"

Klemm: "No. The Amendment I just added, Amendment #1, says that it must be by a trial before a Circuit or Associate Judge, as we talked about in Judiciary."

O'Connell: "Okay. We also discussed the possibilty that even if someone does go to trial and the adjudication is for supervision, the ten dollar fee is still imposed upon the defendant, correct?"

Klemm: "That would be correct."

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- O'Connell: "So the only criteria for the ten dollar imposition is if you go to trial."
- Klemm: "That would be correct. We're trying to obviously take some of the costs of those proceedings, and that's the reason we're doing it this way."
- O'Connell: "Madam Speaker, I would wholeheartedly support this
  Bill. We put rational limitations on it. If the
  municipality is required to expend time to try a case, then
  that municipal... municipality should receive the ten
  dollar benefit. I support the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage... question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 397 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting This is final action. Rave all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Going back now. Ladies and Gentlemen, to Representative Oblinger's Bill. They are ready to have that heard again on Third Reading. That's Senate Bill 312. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly,

  Senate Bill 312 is now identical to House Bill 1260 which

  was Amendment #1. There were some questions addressed to

  me that I didn't feel competent to answer. The Sponsor of

  the Amendment, Representative Bullock, is now here."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, on the question."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

## 58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Senate Bill 312, as amended, in fact, resembles the House. House Bill 1260 which we passed previously and the Bill is This Bill, in effect, deals now in the Senate. with the Sunset Act and, in effect, as the Sponsor Joint Sponsor indicated previously, that the previously... change in the Bill basically says that the Speaker House, the Minority Leader, the President of the Senate, Minority Leader will set for this Assembly a five year plan for agencies to be sunset or to be reviewed. More importantly, they shall notify this Assembly by March of each year of what agencies are due for sunset in particular year. The standing Committees will use the criteria for overseeing certain agencies. And Representative Oblinger had suggested inserting SOME language where there is no standing Committee that the Select Committee would perform the oversight and sunset Representative Hastert raised the question off the review. record a short while ago which I'd like to respond. clearly, Representative Hastert, you are correct that in this legislation, we, in fact, would not be rereviewing agencies that have already have been reviewed."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Oblinger, we have found that this Bill has not been read a third time on three separate days. As a consequence, the Bill may not be heard today. So we might as well take the Bill out of the record."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker, there are several Bills that I have that are listed on the Special Call today and that are still on Second Reading. I asked yesterday that they be moved to Third so we could be heard today. I would now request that this be held... read tomorrow on Third Reading and that this Subject Matter be continued untiltomorrow."

Speaker Breslin: "We will certainly do that, Representative."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Oblinger: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill... The next Bill on the Call where there is ... skipping over those on the Consent Calendar, etcetera, appears Senate Bill 557, Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 557, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
to revise the law in relationship to counties. Has been
read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Repre... Out of the record. Senate Bill 612,

Representative Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 612, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Levin now asks
leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 612 on
Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing no
objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill, Mr.
Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 612, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administration Procedure Act. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 612 is a Bill that's proposed by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to clarify a... procedures with respect to incorporation by reference of generally known standards. It amends the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act to allow the Joint Committee

## 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

on Administrative Rules to determine what standards or guidelines of federal agencies are publicly available for purposes of incorporation by reference in state agency rules. It allows such incorporation without publishing the incorporated material in full, provided such material is readily available to the public. Additionally, this legislation clarifies the existing language of the statute to provide for incorporation by reference of rules and regulations of federal agencies and guidelines and standards of nationally recognized organizations in state administrative rules."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 612. And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."
- Hawkinson: "Representative, can you explain the House Amendment and what the genesis of that was?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin, you have been asked to explain the House Amendment."
- Levin: "The House Amendment, I believe, satisfies the problem raised by the Department of Public Health with respect to incorporation by reference of standards or guidelines of agencies in the United States. I know in Committee..."
- Hawkinson: "Does this... Does this Amendment or the Bill as amended allow an incorporation by reference where there's been no publication of these guidelines or there's been some failure to meet our Administrative Procedure Act?"
- Levin: "Well, we currently allow, in the Administrative Procedure

  Act, certain kinds of incorporation by reference. There

  are currently no standards for that in the Administrative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Procedure Act. And this seeks to clarify what the procedures and standards should be. You know, I know the agencies like to use this. It saves a lot of space in the rules and regs. And where the standard is generally available, they should be able to do that. And that's the intent of the Bill."

Hawkinson: "And is the Bill, as amended, still fully supported by the Joint Committee?"

Levin: "Yes, it is, as well by at least a half a dozen agencies that testified in Committee in favor of the legislation." Hawkinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 612 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 625, Representative Brunsvold. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 625, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Civic Center Act. Has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative..."

Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Brunsvold, amends Senate Bill 625."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 guts the Bill and replaces it with the provisions in House Bill 2421, which passed out of the House with the civic center authorities on it. And I would ask for the adoption of

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 625. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "I might be wrong, if the Clerk could tell us. I don't believe this has been printed and distributed yet."
- Speaker Breslin: "It has not been printed and distributed,

  Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunswold: "The Amendment was... I think this is the third day that the Amendment was filed. And I would just question whether we can come back to this when we get the Amendment distributed."
- Speaker Breslin: "We can, and we would ask the Clerk's Office to be sure that the Amendments gets printed and distributed as quickly as possible. Thank you."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "A Bill that was knocked off the Consent
  Calendar and which we will call now is Senate Bill 448,
  Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr.
  Clerk..."
- Hastert: "Thank you..."
- Speaker Breslin: "No. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 448, a Bill for an Act to amend the General Obligation Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

  No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Second Reading of the Bill or Third Reading of the Bill? That's right. The Bill was on Third Reading. So when it got knocked off the Consent Calendar, it went back to Second Reading. The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consider... no, first asks leave to read the Bill a second time and move it to Third. Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
  Amendments."

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Hastert, amends Senate Bill 448."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "I would defer to Representative Piel."

Speaker Breslin: "Gentle... Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been printed and distributed? It has not, Representative We will come back to it and ask that they get it Hastert. printed and distributed quickly. Senate Bill 640. Representative Ropp. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill 640. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 640, a Bill for an Act to add Sections
to the Grade A Pasteurized Milk and Milk Products Act.
Third Reading of the Bill".

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Ιt is indeed my pleasure to once again offer a Bill that is very important to the nutrition of people in the State Illinois. Senate Bill 640 attempts to increase the regulations dealing with improving the nutritional value of skim milk and two percent milk. Currently, as you may well know, some opposition have said that it's going to increase the cost. Well, I'm saying that the 20 percent increase on the nutritional value, particularly in the area of calcium and protein, is an issue that we ought to deal with at this point. The increase in costs... Well, let me go back and say that the national consumption of milk per person in the United States is only 26 gallons, unfortunately. I'd like for it to be a lot more. I think it would be better. 0f that 26 gallons, half of it is whole milk, and this

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

has no affect on whole milk so we're not affecting the cost whole milk. So of the remaining 13 gallons of the national per capita consumption, we are dealing gallons that will be affected by this Bill per person. The opponents say that it would cost as much as ten cents per gallon. So we're, in effect, talking about a cost person, nationally, of a \$1.30, \$1.30. Now, I ask you, for many. many young people in this country who today are deficient in calcium, a most important nutrient that provides for them the opportunity to grow strong and to fully utilize the strength of their bones and muscles, it's important that this Bill pass. Ladies and Gentlemen. welcome any questions that you have. It's important because we're going to increase the palatability. People like milk that has been added solids, not fats, or protein and minerals in skim milk and two percent. I welcome your support and be happy to answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 640. And on that question, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I rise in opposition to the legislation. This Bill was considered previously by the General Assembly, believe in the last Session of the General Assembly, and think the Bill number is even House Bill 1025, if I recall. I may not be correct about that, but it has been considered before. And what this Bill does simply is require us, as consumers, to consume more milk coming from the cow. That's good for dairy farmers. To get more of the ingredients in the milk about which the Sponsor is talking, it will require some of the milk coming from the cow to dehydrated to produce the ingredients which need to be

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

added to milk as supplements. So that means that at the consumer end of the pipeline, when you go to the grocery store to buy a gallon of milk, what you're going to a gallon of milk that has in it one gallon which came from the cow directly and parts of another gallon from the cow that were dehydrated and inserted into this gallon to increase the num... the ingredients. Nothing is free in this life, so you're going to have to pay, when you buy one gallon of milk, for more than one gallon of milk. It may take five gallons of milk to produce four at the grocery counter. What this that we will artificially create a larger market for milk, and we will artificially increase the price milk to every consumer in this state. gallon of We talk about our children having too much colesterol, too We sure need calcium. I would support whatever we need to do to get calcium to our youngsters, but they get plenty of nutrients from milk. If they eat a balanced diet, they will be just fine. We don't need to artificially create a larger market for the consumption of milk in state and in this nation. And I would respectfully urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In
the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main
question is put. Representative Ropp, to close."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. For the young people in this State of Illinois and for the fact that we are not affecting butterfat content at all - we're affecting

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

protein and minerals, and we urge your favorable vote for the health of Illinois so that we can not only build Illinois right from the very bottom, and that is young people. I urge your favorable vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 640 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Representative McNamara is recognized for one minute to explain his vote."
- McNamara: "Thank you very much. This is... This is not just simply a milk Bill. What really happens is is that the people out in the marketplace right now have a choice. They have a choice to get any quality of milk that they desire. This is an attempt by an industry to force the poor people into getting... buying more expensive milk perhaps not having any of the benefits of that milk at all because it does, in fact, raise the price of milk. hits the people who are the large families, those people that cannot afford the milk. And I think this is a very bad way of doing it. Let the marketplace quide what they need. Let the people, if they wish the higher value. out and purchase it. If they wish the other value of milk, purchase it. Let the marketplace decide. Let's not have a basic industry deciding our fate in life for us."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike, one minute to explain your vote."
- McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We killed this Bill two years in a row, and we killed it earlier this year. To tell you the truth, I forget the amount that it adds to. It's ten to fifteen cents a gallon, and I think the average consumption for an individual is ten gallons. It guess this adds up to 30 million dollars a year. There's no way of getting around it. It's just imposing an additional cost of 30 million dollars on people that drink milk. I

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

think that what is so outrageous is some of the testimony that was sent to us that was presented before Committee. And I think the most outrageous is this fact. The fact is, it says that raw milk from dairy farms would not qualify as milk for consumption, so that we would have a situation where milk coming from a cow would no longer be milk unless you added solids to it. And you add these solids in order to increase the cost, change the taste, decrease the consumption at an added cost to consumers. It's clearly a tax on milk simply to help an industry that already receives two billion dollars a year. I just think it's outrageous to pass this type of legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Boone, Representative Wait." Wait: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd just like to stand in strong support of this Bill. Like Gordy said, this Bill that would only cost a minimum of \$1.30 a year, and I think that's a small price to pay for the additional quality of milk. I might say, yesterday I tried some of the milk myself on skim milk and it made it taste almost like percent milk. two And some of the Representatives tried it, and they were amazed at how much more flavor and body it ... that have. I strong... stand in strong support of this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I'm looking at it from a different point.

Although I own a farm, I don't own any dairy cattle. But I am interested in the Head Start pupils and the WICS program, and I would be happy to think that the milk we were providing them was giving them more nutrient value than we are now giving them."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Panayotovich, to explain his vote."

- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For Representative Ropp, American milk from American cows, how can you argue at American made?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 78 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 734, Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please. Senate Bill 734."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I would like to return the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative?"

Vinson: "I'd like to return the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to
the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
Amendment. Are there... I understand it's on Second.
Read the Bill on..."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Vinson - Steczo - et al."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson."

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this completes the action which we took yesterday by prohibiting the regulation of nighttime baseball in Wrigley Field, and I would move for adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 734. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Before we continue, I would ask for a ruling from the Chair as to the germaneness of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "While we review that question, would you care to speak to the Bill, or should you wait? You prefer to wait?"
- Levin: "Why don't we wait for a moment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, at the request of the Speaker, I'll take the Bill out of the record with the understanding that we can come back to it in a few minutes."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Out of the record. Senate Bill 789, Representative Woodyard. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 789..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative Vinson, we're ready to proceed on your Bill, 734, if you wish. So, Senate Bill 734. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. This Bill has
  been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was
  adopted in Committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by
  Bepresentative Vinson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Vinson has already presented his Amendment. That Amendment was questioned as to whether or not it was germane. The Chair rules that the Amendment is germane and it is in order. Proceed,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Nadam Speaker. In closing, I would simply say
that this is the one vehicle, the one Amendment, the one
possibility for keeping the Cubs in Wrigley Field. I would
urge an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "On the question of the Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I thought I was closing."

Speaker Breslin: "No, you weren't closing. You were just recognized to present the Amendment."

Vinson: "Oh."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, on the Amendment."

Cullerton: "Well, if Representative Vinson wants to give a speech, I'd be happy to defer to him. See if he's through.

If he thought he was closing, and... I think he should be given the opportunity to give a long political speech or whatever he wants to give if he wishes."

Vinson: "I'll do that after I hear what he has to say."

Cullerton: "I have an inquiry of the Parliamentarian. Does the Amendment preempt home rule?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, it does preempt home rule, and it requires a three-fifths vote."

Cullerton: "On Third Reading."

Speaker Breslin: "On Third Reading."

Cullerton: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that there's a little bit of, perhaps, confusion as to this issue, and I'd like to make it as clear as I can. In going around and talking to my colleagues, I found that some of them didn't understand exactly what the posture was of this legislation. Now what this Amendment does is to preempt home rule and what it, in effect, would do is to say that an ordinance that was passed by the City Council in Chicago, by, I believe, a 46

### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

to 2 vote, shall be overturned. That's what the Amendment does, and it would allow then for the Tribune Company which owns the Cubs to put in permanent lights and have as many baseball games at night as they want. Now, yesterday we voted 85 to 25 to allow for temporary lights for the playoff games and the world series only. I hope implicit in that vote was a rejection of this Amendment that would allow for permanent lights whenever. But I think the most important thing to understand - in talking to people they said, 'You know, why is the state even bothering with this? Why don't we just let the local city, the City of Chicago, this decision? Well, the answer is, they have made their decision. They have passed an ordinance which night games at Wrigley Field, in effect. And what this Amendment says is that we're going to overturn ordinance. We're going to go around the local people and we're going to dictate from Springfield that you cannot pass such an ordinance which clearly relates to the local environment. Okay? Just like a zoning issue would relate to a local environment. So, if ... I think that's the most convincing argument to vote against this Amendment. could go down the list of all the things that I pointed out yesterday, the horror stories about having night games for regular seasons. I offered the Amendment yesterday as a compromise so that the Cubs could play world series and playoff games. Now, I think that the existence of this Amendment - I don't know if this is true or not, but ever since this Amendment has been talked about, the Cubs haven't won a damn game. They've lost nine games in a row. They lost again today. They want... They want this issue settled. They won in the day last year. They had the best home record of any team in baseball. They want this to get over with. And this Amendment is a complete

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

rejection of the concept of local control. It is something which we should just clearly not be doing. And for those reasons, I rise in opposition to it and ask you to please vote 'no' on this Amendment."

"The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin." Speaker Breslin: Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I fully concur in the statements of Representative Cullerton in opposition to this Amendment. The Lakeview in Chicago is a gutsy community. community community that feels very strongly about this issue. about property values and about the context of what goes on in their neighborhood. But that community was willing recognize the strong sentiments that the Cubs ought to be able to play the playoffs and the world series nighttime. And they decided that they recognized that and, despite their strong feelings, and despite a lot of die hards, that this was a fair compromise, the Amendment that was offered yesterday, and that they would go along with it. That solves the problem of the Commissioner οf Baseball, Mr. Ueberoth. It solves the problem of those who feel that the Cubs were unfairly treated last year and lost home field advantage. So, the legitimate, concerns of Major League baseball and of others have heen with bу the gutsy community and what they were willing do. to What we have here is unadulterated This has nothing to do with playoffs, corporate greed. nothing to do with the world series. This is a corporation that wants to make a few extra bucks at the expense of a community by having night games during the regular season. I can't understand the motivation. WGN has a monopoly during the daytime. They do very well across the country, and I don't know why they would want to go to nighttime games during the regular season. But it's a very different

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

issue that is presented by this Amendment. We had, I think, solved the problem, the legitimate problem of Major League baseball in terms of the playoffs and the world series. And now we're talking about whether we're going to destroy a community or we're going to protect a community by allowing games during the regular season. No limitation on the number of games. They can have all the games they want. They can come in and can have a increase in crime and traffic and the other kinds of problems. I hope that you will, you know, vote with the community and vote to preserve a neighborhood, because what happens to this community this year can happen to a community in district next year. And, you know, I hope that we'll vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson. Representative Greiman, in the Chair."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Spea... Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this Amendment. A variation on the question put earlier - the question really that many of us are asking is not why is the Legislature involved? Why not leave this to a unit of local government? The better question, as I see it, is why is government involved in this? Why not leave this to the Major League ball club, the Chicago Cubs, when every other Major League ball club can control the scheduling of their games. And if the Major League ball club wants to have lights, they ought to be able to have lights. And I urge your support."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Homer: "I think it's important that we understand what the status of the current law is and how we got here so that we can make an informed decision on this Amendment. And in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

asking that question, I'd say there's a ... I think there's a temptation on all of our parts to try to determine for ourselves the question of whether or not we think there ought to be night games at Wrigley Field. especially for us long time Cub fans. But I think we have a higher responsibility than that in trying to determine that question and in trying to handle our duties here as Legislators in a rational way. So I want to ask a couple οf questions. Pirst of all, as I understand it, Representative Vinson, there are currently two prohibitions against night baseball in Wrigley Field. One is the City of Chicago has an ordinance which prohibits night baseball in the City of Chicago. Is that correct? Or. night baseball at Wrigley Field, I should say. hluow you recognize Representative Vinson, please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Representative, there is a City of Chicago ordinance which prohibits night baseball in Wrigley Field."

Homer: "Alright. And there's also a state statute, under the Environmental Protection Act, which also prohibits night baseball in the City... or in Wrigley Field."

Vinson: "That is correct. The people who oppose this Amendment today, came to the General Assembly and asked the General Assembly to pass a law prohibiting night baseball in Wrigley Field."

Homer: "So, right now there is a City of Chicago ordinance and there's a state statute which prohibits night baseball in Wrigley Field in Chicago."

Vinson: "Yes. Sir."

Homer: "And yesterday we approved an Amendment that would have allowed an exception for post-season play under the state statute."

Vinson: "That is correct."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Homer: "And today we're being asked to prohibit the City of Chicago from enforcing its ordinance which also prohibits night baseball in Wrigley Field."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir. That's correct."

Homer: "Alright. Then, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Again, I that... I think there's a tendency, on all of our parts, to try to determine whether or not we want night baseball in Wrigley Field and in trying to vote on these Bills. I really think there's a principle that transcends that fundamental question, and the principle is, number should there be a state statute which prohibits the playing of baseball in any city in this state at nighttime? And I, for one, think not. I don't think ... we have baseball in Peoria and Springfield in Sox Park and so the question is, what in the world is the Legislature telling the Chicago Cubs or any other team, professional sporting team, whether they should play at nighttime or in the daytime? That's number one. Then the second question, which is the one before us is, should the Legislature, however, be telling municipalities, such as Chicago, how to enforce their zoning ordinance or noise pollution ordinances? And, again, I think the answer It's not the function of the State of Illinois and the State Legislature to do either of those things, either, one, to prohibit by statute the playing of baseball Wrigley Field. We shouldn't be doing that. That's an issue between the Chicago Cubs, the Tribune Company and the local neighborhood in Chicago. Secondly, should we telling the City of Chicago how to enforce it's zoning ordinance? And, again, I think the answer is no. So, I, for one, will support an Amendment which... which deletes the Illinois statute prohibiting night baseball in Field, but I'm also going to oppose an attempt to tell the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

City of Chicago what to do in terms of enforcing its ordinances because that's a question to be decided by the City Council and the Mayor of the City of Chicago, not by the Illinois State Legislature. So, I'm going to oppose this Amendment and I would ask my colleagues to do likewise."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I think Mr. Homer's speech was apt and to the I have decided, after considerable debate, being a Cubs fan, and so has Representative Hawkinson, but I think Mr. Cullerton has a good point. This is his district. It's in the City of Chicago. I certainly wouldn't want this Body to legislate things that occur in my district. whether or not we can play night football and the NIU To me, football stadium. this is a question of local autonomy. I don't think we should have had the statute the first place, and I would oppose it. So, I agree with Mr. Homer, and I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I think there are two issues which you ought consider in deciding how you're going to vote on this... on Amendment. Number one, do you want to come back here and be confronted with an appeal for the taxpayers of Illinois to build a dome stadium in the City of Chicago? You are going to be confronted with that request defeat this. If you pass this Amendment, it will take ... remove any need, any question about the need for a done stadium in the City of Chicago. Number two - and I think this is perhaps even more important - the defeat of this Amendment would essentially say that Illinois, politicians

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

in Illinois are willing to come together and conspire to force an important and highly symbolic business out of the City of Chicago and out of the State of Illinois. I think that's wrong. I don't think we should do that. I don't think we should have done that when we embarked on our attack on Caterpillar Tractor Company a few years ago. That is exactly the same issue and the same parallel that we're dealing with here. I would urge an 'aye' vote so that there can be reasonable consideration of a real compromise to light Wrigley Field for a limited number of games. I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question there are 35 voting 'aye', 78 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the Motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, on Amendment #3."

Vinson: "I withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #3 withdrawn. Further Amendment?"
Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Alright. On the Order of Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 734. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, take the Bill out of the record, please."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of Special

  Call State and Local Government Administration, appears

  Senate Bill 789. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 789, a Bill for an Act to amend the law concerning labor-management relations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Edgar, Mr. Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 789 is a Bill that would set up and create a Labor-Management Grant Program within DCCA. It basically does two things. It creates a 12 member Labor-Management Cooperation Committee and it also gives that Committee the authority to establish between eight and labor-management councils over the state and the funding I can speak from personal experience of a very successful labor-management council in my district in Danville, Illinois. Danville has a very high unemployment rate, nearly 20 percent. About three years ago, people got together and established a labor-management council. It has proven extremely successful, very effective and lot of problems before they became crisis. now we're in a posture of being able to establish these types of labor-management councils over the state, as many other states have adopted. And I would urge your support for this Bill and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Edgar has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 789. And on that, is there any discussion?

The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Mays: "You say that you set up a similar Committee in Danville three years ago, is that correct?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Woodyard: "Yes."

Mays: "And it's worked very, very well, right?"

Woodyard: "That's correct."

Mays: "Did it take any state money to make that Committee work at all or..."

Woodyard: "Yes, there was an original grant, and I want to think it was around 30,000 dollars to set up that original council and I want to think that came through some CEDA funds."

Mays: "And that was conduited through the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs at that time?"

Woodyard: "Yes."

Mays: "Why can't that be done now without this kind of language?"

Woodyard: "JTPA is not... doesn't have that within their purview."

Mays: "You say that CEDA could do that, but JTPA cannot, is that..."

Woodyard: "That's correct."

Mays: "... restructure it, and this would allow JTPA... Would these be federal funds that are being spent or what?"

Woodyard: "GRF funds."

Mays: "General Revenue funds. How much are we looking for for this Program?"

Woodyard: "Presently, the appropriation, and that was within DCCA's budget, and due to the Senate cuts, is now 212,500 dollars of which 170,000, roughly, would be used for the grants."

Mays: "How many communities are going to be eligible for these grants under this Program?"

Woodyard: "We think eight to ten, and they are not designated in... as far as I know."

Mays: "So, what we'd be doing then is basically saying, 'We've got a great idea, but we're going to give you 20,000

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

dollars to make it even a better idea so that we can get this thing off the ground. Is that correct?"

Woodyard: "That's right."

Mays: "Thank you very much. To the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Mays: Sponsor of this measure that the "I agree with the Labor-Management Committee is a very, very good idea, and I think that every community ought to have one. disagree with the Sponsor on this Bill is that, number one, I don't believe that we should ... we have any need to do this in the statute books. 1 think it should be self-evident benefit to all communities in this state to have labor and management sitting down together to discuss economic development strategies. And I further disagree that we should be spending money for this kind of a purpose because it's such a good idea. We shouldn't have to out 20,000 dollar incentives to a few select committees each and every year that this program is going to be existence. For those reasons, I would... I oppose the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. DeJaegher." DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I rise in support of 789. Two years ago, we tried to implement such... a program such as this. Because of lack of funding, it wasn't able to be an ongoing program. I think the time is now that we do join... that labor and business join together, and I think this is the key to a successful operation. I come from a very highly industrialized area. Basically many of the people that reside in that particularly community are union-oriented, but this is their wishes. They want to establish something like this. There's a necessity that we establish something like this. We must move forward with the passage of this

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Woodyard, to close."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we all realize Bill does. And. as I say, it has proven extremely successful in areas of this state, as well as many states. And I would point out, in the grants area, that these actually sunset within a three year period of time. The first year on the grants they would receive up to 75 percent of the cost; the second year 50 percent of the costs; the third year 25 percent of the cost, and then they would receive no more actual money. The Bill is also supported by DCCA, bу the Illinois Manufacturers\* Association, by the State Chamber and by the APL-CIO. so, when you've got that kind of diverse organizations in support for it, it certainly must be a very good Bill, and I urge your support."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

This is final action. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, one minute to explain his vote. Mr. Matijevich? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State and Local Government — Special Call, appears Senate Bill 840. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 840, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading
of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

House. Senate Bill 840 authorizes the Department of Central Management Services to implement a program whereby the state can offer its employees a flexible account fringe benefit programs and whereby those employees would be allowed to choose among various fringe benefits in exchange for shouldering of more of the upfront costs of certain of the coverages. This would all be as authorized by the Internal Revenue Code. I would ask for a favorable vote on this Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 940. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this pass? A11 in favor signify by voting 'ave', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority. hereby declared passed. On the Order of Special Call -State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 872. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 872, a Bill for an Act in relation to funds derived from the sale of migratory waterfowl stamps, gifts, donations, grants and bequests of money for the conservation and propagation of waterfowls. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
Bill 872 amends the Fish Code and the Wildlife Code and
provides that the appropriations from the State Migratory
Waterfoul Stamp Fund shall be made to the Department of
Conservation for the following purposes: 50 percent of all
the funds derived from the sale of the state migratory

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

waterfowl stamps and 100 percent of all gifts, donations, grants and bequests of money for the conservation and propagation of waterfowl for attracting waterfowl and improving the public migratory waterfowl areas within the state. The other 50 percent of the funds derived from the sale of the state migratory waterfowl stamps will be turned over to a non-profit organization for the development of waterfowl propagation areas within Canada or the United States which specifically provide waterfowl for the Mississippi Flyway. I would ask for its... a favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 872. And on that, is there discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those Voting is now open. opposed vote 'no'. This is action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 116... 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 897. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 897, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of
the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon, Ms. Oblinger. Oh, I'm sorry. Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, As. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "This is a similar situation we had on Senate Bill 312.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

And I ask that, as long as it is moved to Third Reading, would it be possible then to have it on a continued call...

Special Call tomorrow? And that was granted for 312."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, it will be on the continued call tomorrow."

Oblinger: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Oh, yes. On the Order of Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 925. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 925, a Bill for an Act to encourage state employee suggestions and to add Sections to the State Comptroller Act. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Ploor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 925, a Bill for an Act to encourage state employee suggestions and add Sections to the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that Representative Barbara Currie had an Amendment she wished to offer to this Bill. Barbara, I can't hear you. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. Could we take this Bill out of the record for a few minutes with the understanding, when Representative Currie's Amendment is ready, we can go... go with it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Of course."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of Special Call - State and Local

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1995
- Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 976. Ms. Satterthwaite? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 976, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Office of County Auditor in certain counties. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All this Amendment does, it takes away the general accountant duties of the auditor in counties of less than... 275,000 or less."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Peoria has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 976. And on that, the Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite"
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would object to the Amendment. What it does is to gut the Bill for many of the counties in this state and, in fact, takes out language that is currently in the statutes, and I would oppose the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "I just had a question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Greiman: "He indicates... Proceed, Sir."
- Tuerk: "I didn't... didn't quite hear you, Representative
  Saltsman, as to what the Amendment does, please."
- Saltsman: "This was asked for by the county board chairman, and it takes the chief financial duties away from the auditor.

  Leaves it up to the board, the sheriffs and everyone to take care of their own financing."
- Tuerk: "To the Amendment then, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a good

  Amendment, should be adopted and then pass the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

#### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it, and the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill. Read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 976, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Office of County Auditor in certain counties. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite, on Senate Bill 976."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Bill is really an update of the county auditors' statute. in more modernized language calling for the accounting procedures that will be under the jurisdiction of the auditor. It indicates that in those counties under 275,000 population, in addition to the other duties that are delineated in the Act, it provides that they will also be the accountant for the county. This is true... This is necessary because the counties above 275,000 population are have a separate accountant, but the smaller counties will combine the duties of the accountant and the auditor as one function of the county. I'd be happy to try to address any questions, but I feel that it is something that is necessary to give our auditors status similar to the other county officials."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Champaign has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 976. And on that, is there any discussion?

  The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a Cosponsor in the House with Representative Satterthwaite of Senate Bill 976, I think that this is what truly can be classified as a good government proposal. It

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

is strongly favored by the Auditor of DuPage County who has examined it very carefully, and he's in accord with the fact that that is precisely what it would do - promote good government. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Piel: "How does this Bill, in its present form, affect Cook
County now?"

Satterthwaite: "It does not apply to Cook County at all."

Piel: "In other words, this just deals with the other counties in the State of Illinois, excluding Cook?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Piel: "Are there any other counties exempt from this?"

Satterthwaite: "No. Just Cook County is exempt."

Piel: "Just looking at our analysis, Representative, I know that, you know, giving the proponents and the opponents, and I noticed that the Urban Counties Council and the Sheriffs' Association are opposed to this. Can you explain why and what their reasoning is for being opposed to it?"

Satterthwaite: "The Orban Counties Council testified in Committee, and I think really it is just a matter of their feeling that responsibilities ought to be left with the county board. However, I would indicate to you that this Bill, in no way, removes the power of the county board to control the expenditures of the auditor's office. They will still provide the budget for the auditor to run their office. This gives internal control to the auditor in regard to that budget once it has been passed."

Piel: "Thank you very much. No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Mr. Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I think there are parts of it that are good government measures; but, by defeating the Amendment that was offered by Representative Saltsman, we've left some bad qovernment measures in this Bill as well. And it's for that reason that I rise in opposition. The Bill. currently stands, would allow the auditors to audit their own books and would take away control from the board. And for that reason and the opposition of ... strong opposition of the counties in my area, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman..."

Satterthwaite: "If I may respond to that, I think that that is in error. What happens is there will still be an outside audit at the end of the year. And so all of the expenditures by the auditor's office would come under audit at that time."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson. Done.
Mr. Tuerk, the Gentleman from Peoria."

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill has Tuerk: "Well, been labeled as a good government Bill. I don't view that way. What this Bill does is expand the powers of the county auditor. Actually, we should diminishing... powers of the county auditor, in my view. diminishing the There are many, many, many counties in this state that feel that the county auditor is unnecessary to begin think we should be addressing those questions rather than expanding his powers. I, too, along with the previous speaker, the Gentleman from Knox, feel that this does give the county auditor the power to audit his own books. I think it belongs with the county board. I stand in opposition to the Bill and ask for its defeat."

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Sangamon, Ms. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As having been both a member of a county board and a county official, I stand in support of this Bill. Number one, in the Constitution, which sets up what county clerks and treasurers and sheriffs can do. their duties аге set out. The auditor is nat constitutional officer. The auditor is a legislative officer created by this Legislature. I think it's high time we spelled out what their responsibilities and duties The county board is not giving up anything. are. county board has allowed our auditor to do the budgeting. the auditing, to do the inventory of supplies, but they keep control of it by voting the auditor's salary and by having a finance committee that meets with the auditor to do these. And if a county does that, if their finance committee meets with the auditor, the county board isn't going to lose any authority, and I would support this Bill and urge you to do the same."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is only one reason for a Bill of this kind, just the same as there's only one reason for an auditor in a county and that is to check the and see that there are no inaccuracies, to see that the money is spent the way the taxpayers would like to spend it and to guarantee against the possibility of fraud. a good Bill, and it should be supported by everyone. It's good in the larger counties like DuPage. It also will work very, very well in the smaller ones. The only way you can quarantee that your politicians are honest is to watch everything they do, check every move they make and guarantee it by certifying it by an auditor. Thank

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Gentleman from Madison, Nr. Wolf."
Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf, moves that the previous question be put. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Madam... Ladies... The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite, to close."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. 1 appreciate the words of support from the Cosponsors of this Bi11 in the House. Representative Oblinger and Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Wojcik is also a Cosponsor in the House. It is a good government Bill. Жe have elected county officials who currently do not have a standard set of responsibilities assigned to them. Bill will provide a uniform set of responsibilities for the It will provide that there be information available to the general public in regard to how they can review these records and see what has happened to the taxpayers dollars. This is a Bill that is supported not only by the Auditors' Association, but by the Taxpayers' Federation of the State of Illinois. It is a good government Bill, and I would urge your support for it so that we can bring this office into line with other county officials and urge your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is now open. This is final action. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle, one minute to explain your vote."
- Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very quickly, because the Bill is going to pass. I think it's about time that the county board chairmen and the county boards realize that an auditor, a treasurer or a sheriff is elected countywise and they work for the people of the county, not the county board. And I think we're going to pass it. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 104 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Special Call State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1030. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of dentistry in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton?"
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1030 is the rewrite of the Illinois Dental Practice Act. The Act that we currently operate under is scheduled to repeal. This has been approved, of course, by the Senate 55 to nothing. And it came out of our Committee II to nothing. We did discuss this Bill earlier today when we rejected some proposed Amendments, and I want to clarify that it is on Third Reading. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. That's correct, Mr. Cullerton."

  Cullerton: "The Bill has been worked in conjunction with the Illinois State Dental Society, Department of R and E, and it deals with the supervision and licensure of dentists.

  It deals with the qualifications for licensure, and I'd be happy to answer any questions dealing with the Bill and appreciate your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1030. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

  Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all know what the outcome of this legislation will be, and we did spend some time on Second Reading, but

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

I want to briefly state my views. The Sponsor did say that the rewrite of the Act was done with the work and cooperation of the Dental Society and the Department of R And I'm sure that's true. and E. And what he left out that there evidently wasn't any input from hygienists who, I think, ought to play a part in rewrite of this Act because I think they play a part in the dental health care. I think, in the main, that the Act and the Bill is good, but I think that the defect in the Act and the failing of the Dental Society, if you will, is that the Bill, as written, really inhibits the dental hygienists from practicing their profession in a manner that will give us quality dental health care. I think that the present which allows the dental hygienists to work under the general supervision and under the direction of the dentists enough protection both for the dentists and protection of those people who want dental care. I think hygienist profession is rightly called the the dental preventive profession. I think that's good because that is a profession that teaches us how to take care of dental disease, and we ought to write a Bill that protects all those who look for quality dental care. Except for that failing, I think it's a good Bill. I think the Dental Society has been shortsighted. I worked very hard fifteen years ago, and we all got together with the Dental Society, with the dental hygienists, and we came up with That wasn't done now. compromise. I'm sorry that that wasn't done now. We'd have had a stronger Bill, and been better off for it. I'm going to vote 'no' have all only for that reason."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Marion,
Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I... and Members of the House, I notice

#### 59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

this Bill provides for the licensing of dentists from foreign universities. Now, the reason I'm concerned that - so does the Medical Practice - and I found out to my horror this week that we were licensing doctors from all over the world, and nobody even makes an inspection. the school and they say, 'Well, we've got just write to certain kinds of teachers. ₩e have so many hours and everything else. And I believe we're admitting doctors to practice in this country who have very few qualifications and certainly not good qualifications. I'd like to know Sponsor if we have any inspection of the schools that we're licensing dentists from. I'm certainly going to ask the same question at some point in time of the doctors put in a Bill that we have to inspect those schools to know what kind of schools we're getting doctors from. is a question, if I may, Mr. Speaker, from the Sponsor. we have any provision for inspecting the schools, foreign schools are sending dentists over here to that he licensed?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. The qualifications for licensure as a dentist include that they... graduation from an approved dental college, passage of an exam or certificate issued by the National Board of Dental Examiners. And the Department of R and E is the one that would administer the licensure of dentists. So, some schools are. you know... foreign universities do not follow the same type of educational So, the law has specifically indicated that there must be an equivalent amount of training. And that. feel. adequate protection and that is ลก would administered again by R and E."

Friedrich: "Well, in case of the doctors, they can practice over here for two years on a temporary license without even

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

taking the exam. Do we have anything like that in here?"

Cullerton: "Well, you know, the Medical Society maybe lobbied...

I don't know what the Medical Society Act... or the Medical Practice Act says. All I can tell you is that in this rewrite what we're saying is the word 'equivalent training' is specifically included, and that has to be evaluated by the Department of R and E. Now, I would think that if you do have a foreign university, let's say some university in London, and there's a dentist from London that comes over here..."

Friedrich: "Let's try India or Phillipines."

Cullerton: "Well, I know what you're saying. So, what we say is that since different foreign countries have different educational systems and some are inferior to our own and some are as good as our own, we say that there must be an equivalent amount of training, and we let the Department of B and B make that decision."

Speaker Greiman: "Okay. Well, I don't want to belabor it. I'm
just saying that in the medical field, at least, they're
not even inspecting these schools. They have no idea what
kind of training they're getting, except if someone from
the university writes and says this is what they get. I
think it's a critical thing, because I'm concerned about
the health care of this country."

Cullerton: "I would suspect that this... Again, I don't know what
the doctors' Act says, but I think this is a very good
protection because it does say it must be equivalent.
Equivalent means equal to, and we're looking for only
having dentists that are trained outside of the United
States to be as good or if not better than the dentists
that are trained in the United States."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Krska."

Krska: "Speaker, I move the previous question."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Krska, has moved that the previous question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question will be put. Mr. Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Let me just clarify. I apologize for not the House. mentioning dental hygienists when I was talking about those who worked on the Bill. It's my understanding that there certainly were extensive discussions with hygienists with regard to the contents of this legislation. understand that the dental hygienists are not agreement with the entire package. My understanding that the Bill does, in fact, codify some rules that are now promulgated by the Department of R and E. The dental hygienists are not in favor of those rules and; therefore, they're not in favor of the codification of those rules. But that's not to say that we are changing what the current practice is. If, in effect, we are codifying those rules, I think we are the ones that are keeping the status quo. appreciate the fact that that interest group is not particularly in favor of this and I'm sure that they can go through the process of trying to amend the legislation And perhaps someday in the future, if this proves to be a problem. can address those мe concerns. But. for now, this Bill really is not that significant a change from the current Act which is sunsetting. And what we are doing is having a new Act go into effect. And for that reason, I would appreciate your support on Senate Bill 1030. "

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113... 114 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We temporarily took Senate Bill 925 out of the record. Mr. Clerk, 925, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 925, a Bill for an Act to encourage state employee suggestions and to add Sections to the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran, on Senate Bill 925."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 925 is a ... as amended is a duplicate of House Bill 578, which passed out of here nearly unanimously a few weeks ago. It creates the employees... State Employees' Suggestion Award Board within Department of Central Management Services. It's designed to encourage and reward those individuals whose ideas save money for the state. The maximum amount that anybody can get is 5000 dollars. As I said before, this passed out of this House almost Bill... a similar Bill unanimously, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 925. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' I'm sorry, Mr. Ropp."
- Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, do I assume that what Representative Currie was interested in is not a part of this particular Bill? Question to the Sponsor. You didn't amend anything onto this as a result of taking it out of the record a few minutes ago."

Curran: "No, we did not."

Ropp: "Okay. I think this is a good Bill. I... all support it."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. favor This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate was also taken out of the record. So, we will 448 return to that Bill. On the Order of State and Government Administration - Special Call, appears Senate Bill 448. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. Mr. Hastert, did you wish to return that Bill to the Order of Second Reading?"

Hastert: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert, asks leave of the House to return Senate Bill 448 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment.

Does the Gentleman have leave? You have leave. The Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hastert."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert, on

Amendment #1."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This makes a dollar change in the appropriation for the GO bonding for the University of Illinois. It's an insignificant change. It's a technical change to make all the numbers the same. However, it also ... very outward... is designed to put this Bill back in Conference Committee so at the end they can adjust the final balance to what the capital Bill... to match the capital Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 448. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Gentleman from Kendall moves that the House waive Rule 37(c) so the Bill may be heard immediately at this time. Does the Gentleman have leave using the Attendance Roll Call? The Gentleman has leave.

  Nr.Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 448, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the General Obligation Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Senate Bill 448 is the GO bonding for the University of Illinois at... It increases the state capital bonding by seven dollars. This Bill will go back into a Conference Committee Report to make a final adjustment for any capital appropriation."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall moves for the passage of Senate Bill 448. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 0 n this question there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And this Bill. having received an Extraordinary Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1121. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1121, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a Bill regarding the definition of library theft. What it does is it lowers the dollar value of books and library materials taken from a library from 300 dollars to 200 dollars. It further goes on and defines the crime of criminal mutilation and vandalism of library materials and provides penalties for that. It's a proposal that's been presented by the Illinois Library Association, and I know of no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1121. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1166. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Agency Act. Third
Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This merely supplies a program to make the earthquake more aware in the local community; whereas, now, we have a state agency that is doing a good job, but this gives the local input from the municipalities, the counties and so forth to give an idea to be alerted what is the plan and let the people know about it... more information about that particular program from the state down to the local

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

agencies. Appreciate your positive vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Saline has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1166. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Matijevich: "Could you give me the date of the last earthquake in the State of Illinois?"

Phelps: "No, Sir, I cannot."

Matijevich: "Oh, Dave's over here. I'm sorry."

Phelps: "I can only say that we sit over the new Madrid Fault, and that is worth being alerted about."

- Matijevich: "Well, Dave, I'm a little older than you. I'm only going on 59. And I can't remember... my father... of course, he wasn't in this country too long, I guess, but I can't remember anybody ever telling me there was an earthquake in Illinois, but maybe... they say... You know, the atmosphere is changing and you never can tell. But I just wonder if we're not going to be expending funds for something that's not going to happen in our lifetime and maybe not in your fathers... Was there one in what? 1871?"
- Phelps: "My colleague says in 1971. In 1968 there was an earthquake that hit the retroscale of almost seven in the midwest. It was felt in several states. I hope this is money that we spend that never has to be utilized that we collect on. However, my whole area has never realized a tornado, but we try to prepare for those disasters."
- Matijevich: "Well, I guess I might vote for it, but I'm not sure
  we need it. It ain't broke yet, we shouldn't fix it, I
  guess, Gordy says."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voted 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 77 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Special Call State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1236. Mr. Shaw? Mr. Shaw? Out of the record. No. Mr. Shaw, welcome. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Housing Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shaw."
- Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All the Bill does is amend the Chicago Housing ... well, amend the Housing Authority to act to make a technical change. Would you take it out of the record for a moment? Would you take it out of the record a moment, Mr. Speaker, for the moment? Mr. Speaker, would you take it out of the record for the moment and could we come back to it?"
- Speaker Greiman: "We will. Thank you. On the Order of Senate
  Bills State and Local Government Administration, appears
  Senate Bill 1249. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1249, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to counties. Second Reading of the Bill.

  Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1 and 2?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm moving to table Amendment #1 and 2 and they are included in an Amendment, #3, which I'm going to

58th Legislative Day

Hoffman."

June 20, 1985

offer. Just so they're all together."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage has moved to table
  Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1249. On that, is there
  any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall
  Amendments #1 and 2 be tabled?' Those in favor say 'aye',
  opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have
  it, and the Amendments are tabled. Further Amendments?"
  Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #2, by Representative
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, he moved... orally, to table Amendments 1 and 2. And the Motion was put tabling Amendment #2. So that further Amendments after 2."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative .

  Hoffman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen the House. Amendment #3 includes or incorporates Amendment #1. which was to eliminate operation and maintenance from consideration of the bonds issued under this legislation. Amendment #2 provided the requisite language in reference to a back door referendum as far publication which is already included in the law but was not included in this Bill. This Bill... or this puts a cap of ten cents per hundred in the Bill. Prior to this, the Bill had no cap at all. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1243. Is there any discussion?

  Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, he indicates he will."
- Cullerton: "Representative Hoffman, the original Bill removed a

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- cap on the tax, the property tax that deals with the court house in DuPage County."
- Hoffman: "Well, it affects all of the collar counties, but DuPage is one."
- Cullerton: "Oh, it does. My understanding was that it only applied to DuPage County, the numbers were such that it only applied to DuPage County. Has that been changed?"
- Hoffman: "It can possibly... It can apply... possibly apply to all of the counties because it's a population or more than 300,000."
- Cullerton: "But then doesn't it go on further and say 'and have an increase in population of thirty percent or more?"
- Hoffman: "Thirty percent or more. That's correct, and it's my understanding that that would also have application to a county other than just DuPage."
- Cullerton: "Okay. You don't know which counties they are. I think the other..."
- Hoffman: "Lake. It certainly would affect Lake."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Well, I know you're concerned about DuPage, and I was under the impression it only applied to DuPage.

  So, if it does apply to Lake, then... getting into the substance of the Amendment, it increases the cap that... on a property tax, right?"
- Hoffman: "As the legislation came across from the Senate, it removed the cap. This replaces a cap at ten percent."
- Cullerton: "But which has the effect of doubling the tax."
- Hoffman: "Has the effect of raising the tax that is currently in the law."

Cullerton: "Which is capped at five."

Hoffman: "Correct."

Cullerton: "And you go to ten."

Hoffman: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Okay. Do you know how much money this is going to

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- raise if the full amount was levied, in DuPage County, for example?"
- Hoffman: "I am counseled that, at this rate, it would raise about seven million dollars annually."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, what is the purpose of deleting 'operation and maintenance' from the Bill? That's what the Amendment does."
- Hoffman: "The purpose of the original statute was for construction and renovation. And we put the language back in the same form as it was originally in that area."
- Cullerton: "Does this contemplate a new facility in DuPage?"
- Hoffman: "Yes."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, the one other question I have is concerning the referendum. There's no need for a referendum on this, as I understand it."
- Hoffman: "There is a provision for a back door referendum."
- Cullerton: "Okay. I really think that before we debate this on Third Reading we should look into whether it applies to other counties, because I was under the impression that it was drafted with the intent that it only apply because I know DuPage is seeking this. And I think that if apply to Lake, for example, that the Representatives from Lake should know that We. are potentially, you know, allowing for a tax increase. And I'm not..." /
- Hoffman: "Well, that... in response to that suggestion, let me say that's in the current law. We're not changing that.

  That's current law. We don't change that."
- Cullerton: "Well, you're changing the cap."
- Hoffman: "I'm changing the cap, but we're not changing the application. You're suggesting that we're changing the application, and we're not."
- Cullerton: "Well, would the cap be increased for any county other

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

than..."

- Hoffman: "The cap would be increased for any county that met that criteria."
- Cullerton: "And the question I have is do you know what those counties are?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I know... I know one... I know, for sure, that it affects DuPage and my supposition is that it would affect more than that."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."
- Terzich: "Representative Hoffman, this only applies to DuPage?

  And it also provides for a tax increase?"
- Hoffman: "This is a question that was raised by the previous speaker, and my response was that this legislation currently applies to counties having a population of more than 300,000 and an increase in population of thirty percent or more from one decennial census to the next."
- Terzich: "Well, does this mean then the Republicans would have to vote for a tax increase?"
- Hoffman: "Pardon me?"
- Terzich: "Does this mean then the Republicans would have to vote for a tax increase if the Bill passes?"
- Hoffman: "This gives the county... this gives the county board the opportunity to implement this legislation by resolution of the county board."
- Terzich: "Gee. Well, this should be interesting. We hope we get a good Republican vote count on this piece of... fine piece of legislation."
- Hoffman: "Thank you for your help."
- Terzich: "Hey, you have it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Purther Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "I am advised by the Clerk that there are fiscal notes with respect to the Bill as amended. So, the Bill will remain on the Order of Second Beading. On the Order of State and Local Government Administration - Special Call, appears Senate Bill 1370. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill".

Clark Leone: "Senate Bill 1370, a Bill for an Act in relationship to regional correctional facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. This creates the Regional Correctional Pacilities ŧο the Director of Corrections to make grants to counties assist in the construction of regional correctional facilities. The southern most counties of this state, which make up most of my district, do not have the economic base, the assessed valuation to even remodel, maintain the present jails. The overcrowding that has been forced upon them by many of the decisions from the misdemeanants in the court have put very much strain on the present situation and now they are faced with meeting the deadline, January 1st, to come up with a new jail concept. This merely gives them assistance in a regional concept that several rural counties could locate a centralized jointly come together jail, possibly, and with finances and build a facility to facilitate those counties which a number... somewhat five to six in the area which we're trying to propose here. I appreciate your cooperation."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Saline has moved for the passage

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

of Senate Bill 1370. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question... Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I simply would like to concur with what Representative Phelps had to say. In parts of the state now, with the mandate for the jail situation as it is, it's a very serious problem we have. We have jails being closed by the Department of Corrections in our area. This is something that we have to look at it, a regionalization of those jail facilities. And if it's not something we have money to do it with, we're not going to be able to comply with federal law. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold."
Brunsvold: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for a question."

Brunswold: "Are there any grants in the Bill for the building of the jails, and how much money would be involved?"

Phelps: "Thank you. The way I understand it, there would be grants available not less than 10,000 dollars, if I remember right. I do not have all the analysis here.

But... And I believe it would have the certain population county to even qualify to meet these grants."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think we need to address the situation also that a lot of counties in the state have already built jails under those provisions and have not received any assistance. Rock Island County, for example, has built a seven million dollar jail with a tax increase to the residents of Rock Island County without any grants or help from the state. And Mercer County right now, my other county is also involved in that process without any help from the state. So, I think we need to look carefully at the situation, whether we want to start now at this late

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

date to supply grants to some of the counties that should, as the other counties have done, proceed on their own. The idea... the concept of a regional jail is fine. I would support that position, but not the idea of using state monies now at this late time to build these jails for some of the southern counties. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Hawkinson: "Representative, one of my counties just recently dedicated a new jail in Peoria County and, yet, they've indicated that they are in favor of this Bill. It's my understanding, and you tell me if I'm correct, that this Bill would allow grants to go to counties that have already built the jails or are in process of building them. And, in addition, is it correct that if there's going to be an annex that would be built or an expansion of some kind in addition to simply a new jail that these grants would also be available to counties in that position?"

Phelps: "This concept, first of all, is qualified by two or more contiguous counties that make up a population of more than 30,000. Now, I don't know if that qualifies your area or not."

Hawkinson: "So, it's limited to counties of that small
population?"

Phelps: "This particular Bill is, yes."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

Phelps: "30,000 or more."

Hawkinson: "That's when they're in combination? Could a single county with more population than 30,000 qualify?"

Phelps: "Two or more, Sir."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm."

Klemm: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Klemm: "What would happen, Representative, two very large counties decide to get together and form this region by forming this board? Would they still qualify then?"

Phelps: "You say two or more larger counties?"

Klemm: "Yes, two very large counties, Cook County and Lake County, for example, they decide to have representatives on this board as an advisory board. They recommend that a quote, ungote, 'regional facility' be built one year in Cook County, the next year in Lake County. I mean, couldn't that be possible?"

Phelps: "That might be a good idea. This Bill does not address that. This is... really the genesis or the idea of this Bill was to accommodate those counties that do not have the economic base. For example, Polk County in my district, forty percent of the district is federal..."

Klemm: "I understand... I understand that. Does your Bill say that? That's all? Does your Bill... Would that limit that to meet what your saying? That's all I'm asking."

Phelps: "Okay."

Klemm: "No further questions."

Phelps: "The advisory board would have that discretion to decide what you're asking."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 86 voting 'aye', 26 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Order of Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears House Resolution 333. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 333, pertaining to downstate Illinois buslines."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Jefferson... I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "What?"

Speaker Greiman: "House Resolution 333."

Richmond: "Out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Richmond, how we doing?"

Richmond: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 333 urges the Illinois Commerce Commission to reject the Gulf Transport Company's petition to abandon certain bus routes. There's a network of bus routes in southern Illinois that's about to be abandoned by this company, and they are critical to our area for linking up transportation for those who use buses to Springfield, St. Louis and so forth. I would urge the passage of House Bill (sic - Resolution) 333."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Jackson has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 333. And on that, is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Resolution be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. On this Order of Business, we have several Bills that were taken out of the record. We shall return to those Bills at this time. On the Order of State and Local Government Administration - Special Call, appears Senate Bill 14. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Grant Park. Third Reading of the Bill"

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Grant Park. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 14..."

Speaker Greiman: "No. Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, there is Amendment #1 offered. It has been printed and distributed."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bullock, you are correct. So we will return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Bullock, amends Senate Bill 14..."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, on Amendment #1."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 14 merely deletes the effective date of the Bill. I move its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 14. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clark Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Bullock asks leave of the House to warve Rule 37(c), using the Attendance Roll Call, so that this Bill may be heard at this time. Does the Gentleman have leave? He has leave. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Grant Park. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 14 passed the Senate 56 to nothing. of Committee 10 to 0 and has not received a out dissenting vote in the House. The Bill, in effect, extends the current boundaries of Grant Park - that part of the 'S' curve in the City of Chicago, along Lake Shore Drive, South Lake Shore Drive. And basically the purpose for this Amendment and the purpose for the legislation is that the territory will be used for public purposes only. The additional territory is subject to the jurisdiction of the City of Chicago. And obviously the legislation is intended to preserve the beautiful lakefront in the City of Chicago to accommodate that and to effectuate that change as a result of the 'S' curve construction. The Bill, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is sorely I would urge an 'aye' vote." needed.
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 14. And on that, is there any discussion?

  The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "I don't oppose the Bill, but I'm curious. What is now east of the straightened 'S' curve? What is the condition of the land there? I mean, is it.. is money going to have to be expended to get it into park district type condition?"
- Bullock: "Yes. East of the 'S' curve is part of the lake.

  There's some of the harbors out there, the boats. There
  will have to be some construction. We just want to make
  certain the construction does not mitigate against the
  lakefront ordinance and the..."
- McCracken: "Is there currently an ordinance in effect relative to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the boundaries? Is there something that the City has to do to..."

- Bullock: "The language needs to be clarified because, with the construction of the 'S' curve, we're moving that boundary further east, and this legislation would include that land that is between the 'S' curve and Lake Shore Drive."
- McCracken: "But the State Government does that? You don't... the

  City doesn't dictate what its park boundaries are... or the

  park district?"

Bullock: "In the park district, yes."

McCracken: "So, this would authorize the park district to annex that or... or what exactly is it that this..."

Bullock: "Okay. The convenant and the original dedication of Grant Park in 1839 prohibited the erection of buildings in a described territory as incorporated in this Act. And..."

McCracken: "So, it's an issue of state law?"

Bullock: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. Alright, thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you... excuse me. I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield to a question, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Piel: "The property presently - who owns the property presently?"
Bullock: "The property presently is owned by the Chicago Park

District and Grant Park."

Piel: "Okay. If the property presently is owned by Grant Park, you know, I don't understand why we, as a Body, are, you know, going with legislation to say that this is Grant Park

if Grant Park already owns ... "

Bullock: "Representative Piel, all units of governments are creatures of the state. The Chicago Park District is a separate municipality and must, in fact, derive its powers and duties from the Illinois General Assembly."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Piel: "But it already owns the property, correct?"

Bullock: "That is correct. There is new property being created as a result of construction of the '5' curve."

Piel: "But, in other words, what you're saying is that this is not technically... 'technically', quote, unquote, classified as part of the property, even though they own the property."

Bullock: "The property that we are referring to now becomes park district property once we pass this Bill."

Piel: "Once... In other words, it's not park district... okay.

But it's not classified technically now as..."

Bullock: "We're expanding the Grant Park. We're expanding, with this legislation, that territory that is encompassed as as result of moving the '5' curve."

Piel: "Okay. One final question. Are there any buildings on this
property presently?"

Bullock: "No."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."

Huff: "Yeah, Larry, perhaps maybe I can lend something towards the clarification of this Bill. It was my understanding that the property originally was vested to the park district, but the park district deeded it over to the Department of Transportation for the purpose of the construction of the 'S' curve. Is that not so? And now that the... that portion of land that was not used or not involved in the straightening of the 'S' curve is now being requested back or asked to be vested back to the park district."

Bullock: "We are, in fact, saying that that land, Representative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Huff, that was created as a result of the expansion of the 'S' curve, in fact, belongs to the Chicago Park District and, as a result of that, within the jurisdiction of the park district, we want to make certain that there are no buildings erected in that area to protect the lakefront."

Huff: "Well, as a legal matter, a technicality, the land presently belongs to the Department of Transportation."

Bullock: "Yes."

Huff: "I believe that's correct. So, this legislation will simply convey that portion of the property that... I'm sorry, that portion of the 'S' curve that was not involved in the actual construction back to the park district."

Bullock: "Yes."

Huff: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."

Harris: "Representative, just so I... to help me out just so I have an idea of exactly where this land is. Are we talking about where the old naval armory used to be? Is it this section of the 'S' curve that we're at?"

Bullock: "No. No."

Harris: "Is it... Are we talking about... If we're moving east, are we talking about the landfill that was created?"

Bullock: "Yes."

Harris: "Okay. Who own... the park district currently owns that landfill? Is that what you're saying?"

Bullock: "No. If I had a graphic depiction for you for those not familiar with the City of Chicago, Lake Shore Drive, east and south... North and South Lake Shore Drive, to the east of Lake Shore Drive was property just before you got to the harbor where the boats are moared. We have now expanded

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Lake Shore Drive eastward by straightening out the 'S' curve. We are, in effect, saying that property which we expanded into for the 'S' curve comes now to the park district and that we, in fact, are expanding Grant Park eastward. And we're saying that that land belongs to the park district in Grant Park."

Harris: "Alright. I understand that. But who owns it now? I mean, it's been created because of a landfill, right?"

Bullock: "Well, as Representative Huff says, DOT would have...

obviously owned the land. He was correct. That's why they

constructed... that is state property. That is state

property."

Harris: "Thank you."

Bullock: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun."

"Thank you. Madam ... Madam Speaker. I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think one of the reasons for all the questions is that everybody afraid looking at this like there's a sleeper or there's a trick or there's something going on here that you short, there isn't. missing. Ιn This Bill straightforward as Representative Bullock has explained. There is nothing in this Bill that should be of any concern. It simply is a matter of having to come to the Legislature because of the crazy way the Park District Code is written. I rise in support of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Being no further discussion, the question is,

'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting
'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This
is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question
there are 106 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 3 voting
'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Special Call State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 405. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 405, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Chain O'Lakes-Fox River Water Management Agency Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm."
- Klemm: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave of the House to move Senate Bill 405 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? He has leave.

  Mr. Clerk, Amendments on Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Cullerton, amends Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment #1."
- Cullerton: "Yes, this Amendment adds a mental state to the criminal penalty which is included in the Bill. Move for the adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 405. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm, asks leave of the House to waive Rule 37(c), with the Attendance Roll Call, so this Bill may be heard at this time. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is hereby granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 405, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Chain O'Lakes-Fox River Management Agency Act. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klenm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Honse. Last year. the General Assembly approved the creation of the Chain O'Lake-Fox River Management... Management Agency upon the approval of a referendum of the voters in that district. Last March the voters did vote and overwhelmingly adopted the creation of this agency. However, in the drafting of the legislation, we overlooked a few changes and corrections that had to be included, and this Bill, 405, does that. What it does is impose a civil penalty of up to 100 dollars for persons who knowingly fail to pay the required user fees. It makes technical changes in the legal description of the Agency's territory were inadvertently described incorrectly. And it also requires that board members who sign petitions and are elected to this post must live within the territory. changes were overlooked, and I do ask for your adoption so we can include this in the Act itself. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McHenry moves for the passage of Senate Bill 405. And on that, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Klemm, under the current law, these user fees... at least 75 percent of these user fees must be used to improve the waterway. That's the current law."

Klemm: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "My question then. Now, with this Bill, we're allowing for a civil penalty of up to 100 dollars to be imposed upon those people who don't pay the user fee. What is your intent with regard to the civil fines? Where are

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

they to go? Are they also going to be spent with 75 percent of them to improve the waterway or not?"

- Klemm: "That is the intent. We wish to have, rather than creating a bureaucracy of spending monies, we have this limited so that the fees that they collect, I believe I think that says on page six, line nine, that the income from the fees collected, including the fines, would go toward this improvement of the waterways in the Chain."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, what... what are the... who pays these user fees and what are they for?"
- Klemm: "There are two classifications of votes that may have user fees imposed if it's adopted after open hearings and by the elected board of trustees or directors. One is that the user fee could not be more than 50 dollars for a vote in the highest classification and the other would be no more than 10 dollars of a vote of a lower classification. These are annual fees that are charged for voting and for maintaining those waterways in that area."
- Cullerton: "Okay. So, if someone didn't pay the user fee, there would be a civil action brought against them to collect these fines. And... right?"

Klemm: "Correct."

- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, the question is, what would the venue be for the cause of action? Would it be where the person who didn't pay the fees where they resided, in the county in which they resided, or could it be in a county in which the cause of action arose, in other words, in another county?

  Do I understand that there's more than one county involved?"
- Klemm: "There are two joint counties, McHenry and Lake Counties."

  Cullerton: "Okay. And the user... Let's say someone... the user

  fee could involve the use of a dock or something like that.

  Could you give me an example of when a user fee would have

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

to be paid?"

Klemm: "Boating in the Chain, for example."

- Cullerton: "Okay. So, if you're voting in one of the counties,
  and you don't pay the user fee, but you live in the other
  county, the only question is, where would be the proper
  venue to sue that individual for the fine?"
- Klemm: "Well, since the Agency is made up in two particular counties and since the Agency would have the authority, I think it would be almost immaterial. If the Lake County sheriff were to make the citation, they may have to appear in the Lake County courthouse. Or, if the McHenry County sheriff were to do it, I guess it would be the McHenry County courthouse."
- Cullerton: "Okay. So, as a practical matter then... as a practical matter then, your intent would be that the venue could be in the county where the cause of action arose, because that would be where the... that would be the one who would give the civil... who would issue the citation. So, your intent is to have that person go to the courthouse of the county in which the citation was issued."
- Klemm: "Well, probably the intent for those... the policing agency that the Management Agency has an intergovernmental relationship to do the policing. I would think that would be the venue that it would be heard."

Cullerton: "Okay. Fine, thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Order of Senate Bills, Special Call State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 416. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 416, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to spouse maintenance and child support. Has been read a second time previously. No Amendments have been adopted."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, McCracken, amends Senate Bill 416 as follows."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook... from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 would allow the clerk to hire a part-time attorney strictly for the purpose of enforcing maintenance and non-support orders entered pursuant to divorce and custody decrees, and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 416. On that, is there any discussion? Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Couldn't you give me the genesis of the Amendment,

  Representative... or attorney McCracken?"
- McCracken: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir. My Chief Judge and clerk sat me down one day and said that the Judge would not take judicial notice of a delinquency in a support or maintenance case, so that, in order to enter enforcement orders or in order to enforce the support order, someone had to bring the case before him into court. And..."
- Giorgi: "Don't you have a special assistant attorney assigned to child support cases in..."
- McCracken: "By Public Aid, right, but they're not doing the job."

  Giorgi: "You do. They're not doing their job. Would you file

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

charges against him with the Bar Association?"

McCracken: "No, no. It isn't... It isn't that type of issue.

I'm not sure how they're compensated; but, for some reason,

the job isn't getting done on a timely basis and the clerk

wants to expedite the maintenance and support."

Giorgi: "You know the law school he went to?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Giorgi: "No, do you know the law school that he went to, the guy that isn't doing his job?"

McCracken: "Oh, the one that ... he didn't ... "

Giorgi: "Not doing his job."

McCracken: "No, I don't know which one it was."

Giorgi: "Could it have been Harvard?"

McCracken: "No, no, it wasn't Harvard."

Giorgi: "Well, if you guys want to make some makework for lawyers, you can support this Amendment. I don't really care."

McCracken: "I wouldn't have asked for it, but the Judge says that without someone withstanding, they won't enforce these orders."

Giorgi: "You want to put the Judge's name in the record?"

McCracken: "Well, it's my Chief Judge. That's all."

Giorgi: "Question."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

Cullerton."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment #3."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

the House. The Bill provides of an annual fee of 20 dollars for the collection and disbursement of the maintenance and child support by the county clerk. The Bill inadvertently allowed for the deduction of postage in addition to the 20 dollar fee. So, what we are doing with this Amendment is saying that they can't collect postage in addition to the 20 dollars. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 416. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "I support the Amendment. It doesn't delete mine, does it?"

Cullerton: "I hope... hope not."

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Winnebago,
Mr. Giorgi, moves to a Rule 37(c) with the Attendance Roll
Call so that this Bill may be heard at this time. Does the
Gentleman have leave? He has leave. Mr. Clerk, read the
Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 416, a Bill for an Act relating to spouse maintenance and child support. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides that in counties of populations under 100,000,000... or a million provides an annual fee of \$20 to the circuit clerk for collecting and

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

disbursing maintenance and child support payments. One Amendment provides that an attorney be allowed to pursue these cases and the other takes care of the stamp deduction. So, the Bill is pretty clear and I'd urge its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago has moved for passage of Senate Bill 416 and on that, the Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for question."

Olson: "Zeke, this \$20 charge, would this be a part of the court order at the time that the dissolution is entered? Is that the way you construe that to be?"

Giorgi: "It's not a part of the court order. Just a part of the clerk's duties."

Olson: "So, he arbitrarily would get the \$20..."

Giorgi: "That's right."

Olson: "Upon the dissolution..."

Giorgi: "Piling of a... that's correct."

Olson: "Do you have a impact of what it might be worth for Ron...
in Winnebago?"

Giorgi: "No idea. Divorces are occurring too rapidly."

Olson: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is an important piece of legislation for circuit clerks in hard-pressed, large counties who have had serious cutbacks relative to their county funding. And I will support the Bill and the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill...' Yes, I'm sorry. Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr... Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Hicks: "Yes, Representative Giorgi, who pays the \$20? Do I pay it or does my ex-wife pay it?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Giorgi: "Yes, yes, you do?"

Hicks: "So the man always pays it?"

Giorgi: "Unless you've got somebody else that will pay for you."

Hicks: "The person obligated to pay the support pays it, is that correct?"

Giorgi: "The one that's generally on the losing side.

Hicks: "Well, I just wondered. I wanted to know. Now, is this going to be retroactive back to all of us that are currently paying support?"

Giorgi: "It's not retroactive."

Hicks: "What about from now on? Am I going to have to pay it from this day forward?"

Giorgi: "That's correct. Every year, once a year."

Hicks: "Do I pay that January 1st? I mean I want to budget so I
make sure I have that available for me to pay."

Giorgi: "I'll make special arrangements with you with your circuit clerk."

Hicks: "Pine, thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question, there are 102 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills - State and Local Government Administration Special Call, appears Senate Bill 431. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 431, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of
the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, on Amendment #1.1"
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I request to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #1 withdrawn. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Giglio."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio. On Amendment ... #2, Mr. Giglio."
- Giglio: "I move to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio withdraws Amendment 2. Further
  Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, on Amendment 3."
- Giorgi: "Request leave to withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Giglio."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio, Floor Amendment #4."
- Giglio: "Request to withdraw Amendment #4."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 431, a Bill for an Act to amend... a

  Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal

  Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "The Bill as it is now constituted allows... it adds one deputy of each of the elected municipal officials and the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

municipal manager as an exemption to civil service classification. That's all the Bill does."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago moves for the passage Senate Bill 431. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none... Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Giglio. being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor say 'aye'... I'm sorry, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. of Special Call - State and Local Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1236. Mr. Curran. Mr. Mr. Shaw, are you prepared on 1236 now? You wish to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Housing Authorities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. All 1236 does is people who apply... who are living in CHA housing across the state and apply for educational grants, that the Housing Authority would not apply that, would not use that grant to... for the purpose of ... of adjusting that rent... or changing them rent. So, I have received many complaints in my district of people who go and want to further their education and receive the grant, apply for a grant and receive the grant and then the Housing Authority turn around and make the grant a part of their income and therefore raise their rent. So this, 1236, would prohibit

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

them from doing that throughout the state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shaw, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1236. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Leverenz: "I was listening very intently to your description there and I know there is an issue in the City of Chicago relative to scattered site housing, but as you explained that, you said CHA housing across the state. Is it that you have CHA housing across the entire state or is that just in the City of Chicago?"

Shaw: "That's the City of Chicago, but housing, public housing across the state."

Leverenz: "Public housing, yes, we have that across the state."

Shaw: "Right. Right."

Leverenz: "I didn't know if you had CHA housing..."

Shaw: "No, no, public housing. Beg your pardon."

Leverenz: "Thank you. I'm for the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, indicates he will."

Piel: "Okay, so basically the way the Bill is now, with the Amendments on... correct me if I'm wrong, Amendment #2 has been adopted to the Bill?"

Shaw: "Yes, it has."

Piel: "Okay, so we are talking about any community with 10,000 or more inhabitants, correct?"

Shaw: "Right."

Piel: "Okay, presently, without the Bill, what is determined as far as eligibility under this type of a program?"

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Shaw: "What do you mean 'eligibility'?"

Piel: "Well, as a... presently, for this type of a program, what are the eligibility standards? How do they set up the eligibility for this type of a program?"

Shaw: "Well, the only thing that happens here, if you are living in CHA housing... I mean, CHA... if you are living in public housing, anywhere in the state, and you apply for an educational grant to further your education to get out of the CHA housing, they usually will apply that to your... as income and charge you rent accordingly."

Piel: "Okay, let me see if I've got it correct. If you lived in a house... CHA, let's say, for instance..."

Shaw: "Not C... okay, public housing."

Piel: "Okay, public housing. Alright, you live in public housing and they are determining their rent, setting their rent and part of the income at the current time in establishing a person's income, if they... if they've got a brilliant child who has got a, let's say, a \$5000 scholarship to the University of Illinois, for instance, this would be included in their present income in establishing the rent?"

Shaw: "That would... that's the way they now do it. Right, that's the way they now do it."

Piel: "Thank you very much. I support the Bill. I think it's something that when a person passes, you know, through school and they have exceptional abilities to where they get a scholarship, I don't think that when a person is struggling on a set income that they..."

Shaw: "Thank you."

Piel: "... the scholarship should be included in that and I would support it. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff. Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

- Friedrich: "Did I understand you that this does not apply in towns under 10,000? I've got four towns in my county with public housing. Now, have you got a separate deal for Chicago and one for towns of 5,000? What kind of a deal is that?"
- Shaw: "No, what I will do, I will yield to Mr... Representative

  Berger over there... Bergman... Barger, I'm sorry."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Barger."
- Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Friedrich, the reason for that is public housing authorities can only be established in communities of over 10,000, so in your smaller communities, public housing authorities may not be established. Therefore..."
- Friedrich: "We... Well, this is the county housing authority though and the community is only 5,000."
- Barger: "This Bill also covers counties, not just municipalities, but also county housing authorities."
- Priedrich: "Okay, thank you. Thank you. Thank you."

  Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. Barger. Mr. Ropp, Gentleman from McLean."
- Bopp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think you've got a good Bill here for a change and I can't imagine that the... there would be any indication that the income would be based on the fact that someone had received a scholarship. I mean that's... that's totally unrealistic and I'm glad you finally brought this to our attention."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 1

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay. Mr. Terzich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to know who is responsible for this fine chicken dinner we had this evening? Well, whatever... Well, whatever. I'd just like to thank whoever was responsible. The chicken was good."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Speaker and the Minority Leader have been so gracious to provide you with your chicken dinner."
- Terzich: "Very good. Otherwise, I was going to take credit for it. The Croations like to take care of the people of the House here."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Thank you."
- Terzich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Minority Leader Daniels for the fine dindin."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Terzich, I did want to correct... make a correction. The Chair was in error. The goodies came from the House Trust Fund. That's the fund that is used for flowers and things like that, so, in a sense, we have taken care of our own meal tonight and we are probably better for it. Alright, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson in the chamber? Yes, the Chair recognizes Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "This on House Bill... Senate Bill 558, is that correct?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Johnson. Do you have a Motion with respect to that Bill?"
- Johnson: "Yes, I would move to return that to Second Reading for the purpose of tabling an Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, moves to return Senate Bill 558 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of a Motion. Does the Gentleman have leave?

  Gentleman has leave. Mr. Johnson moves to table Amendment

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- #1 to Senate Bill 558. And on that, Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "I believe the Sponsors of the Amendment,
  Representatives Ropp and Nash would agree with this. It's
  simply a misunderstanding."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 559. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clark O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Ropp and Nash."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Withdraw that Amendment, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendment?"
Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Committee Report."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leverenz, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 19, 1985, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' Senate Bills 132, 145, 160, 167, 168, 226, 449, 507, 1033, 1410 and 1411; 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 308, 403, 428, 451, 455, 458, 459, 461, 464, 467, 468, 470, 472, 473, 481 and 552."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it is the intention of the Chair to call Bills on Special Calls that will be on tomorrow's Special Call on the Order of Second Reading so that those Bills which must be read for a second time today will be read and be in the appropriate position tomorrow.

  Accordingly, on Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons, page 22, appears Senate Bill 258. Mr. Keane. Alright, yes.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Alright. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 258, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Senior Citizens' and Disabled Persons'
  Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act.
  Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Bill having been read, hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. On the Order of Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons, appears Senate Bill 384. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Page 15."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend the Respite Demonstration Program Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions..."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Bowman."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, on Amendment #1."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment and includes or puts back in some language that was inadvertently deleted from the Bill in a Senate Amendment. Makes this Bill identical to one of the House Bills in the Alzheimer's package that we passed over to the Senate. Specifically, we add language to the definition of target population to include persons suffering from Alzheimer's disease who are 55 years of age or older. I move adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 384. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye',

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Representative Breslin, could you come to the podium, please? On the Order of Senior Citizens Special Call, page 26, appears Senate Bill 639.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 639, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging . Second Reading of the Bill.

  Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendments #1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. What? There is a request for a fiscal note so the Bill will remain on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 954 on page 28 on your Calendar.

  Representative Soliz. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 954, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of an Illinois Act on Aging. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Oblinger."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment was agreed to among Mr. Soliz, Senator Smith and me. The grant is to be made to an institution of higher learning in order to do the study. The Department on Aging does not have a research department that could have handled this.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

They have always had their research projects done through a board of... through a higher institution of learning and then we also wanted to be sure that if they were going to be training the people and making a study of the jobs for which they are able to be hired, that we didn't train them for jobs which they would be precluded by law because of being sixty years of age and over. So we put that in so they wouldn't be trained for firemen, policemen and so forth and then not be able to serve. And I would appreciate..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 954. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, Shall Amendment question is, #1 to Senate Bill 954 be All those in favor say 'aye', all those adopted? say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill... We can go back now to Senate Bill 258 for Representative Keane. That appears on page 22 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 258.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 258, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens' and Disabled Persons' Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1004,
Representative Homer, appears on page 19 on your Calendar.
Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act to amend the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Nursing Home Care Reform Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments.

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, hold the Bill on Second Reading. Senate
Bill 1047, appears on page 29 on your Calendar.

Representative LeFlore. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Act on the Aging. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Oblinger."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, the original required the Department of Bill Insurance and Department on Aging to do a feasibility study of setting up an advocacy program for Medicare and Medicare related areas for advising and counselling senior citizens. Because they already have a counselling program in existence in the Department on Aging, I recommended to Senator Smith and Representative LeFlore, and they agreed with me, that they would then just develop a training program to train counselors they already have employed to be able to provide information to the Medicare beneficiaries and that they would then report to the General Assembly by December 1st of 1986 on the implementation of this program. move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1047. On that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1047 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 10... excuse me.

Senate Bill 133, appears on page 14 on your Calendar.

Representative Piel. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 133, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for burial of certain deceased veterans and their relatives by counties. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 230, on page 21 on your Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 230, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On the Order of Human Services, those Bills that need to be read a second time in order to be ready for action tomorrow include, first of all, Senate Bill 295. It appears on page 15 on your Calendar. Representative White. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 295, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #..."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, is Amendment #2 on the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Bowman."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Leave to withdraw #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative White."

Speaker Breslin: "Who is the Sponsor of the Amendment?

Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to offer Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 295 and all it does is puts a quotation mark... it's corrective language and inserts the number two. This is corrective language and that's basically it. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 295. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to 295 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill will be held on Second Reading.

Senate Bill 299 appears on page 22 on your Calendar.

Representative Braun. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 299, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Levin."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the vou. House. House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 299 establish a lien right for home health services similar to that currently enjoyed by other providers of medical services. It is endorsed by the Illinois Hospital Association as well as the Association of Agencies. Originally, it was House Bill 367 that was reported out of the Judiciary I Committee, but was not I have checked with called. both the Chairman of the Committee and the Minority Spokesperson, as well as the Department of Public Aid and they have no problem with the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 299. The Gentleman... On that question, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Before we establish legislative intent, everybody who wants to do something else can just go and have a Pepsi or go ahead because this is really boring, but I do want to ask some questions here that... no, I don't need that."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Johnson: "What... What would your intention be, Representative Levin, where, for example, a individual receives a \$100,000 settlement or award and you have roughly equal amounts of liens, hospital, the doctor and the home health care provider. It's your intention that the attorney fee be deducted first, is that right?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "That is the current law, that the attorney's lien is

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- superior and this would... my intention is that that would continue with respect to this."
- Johnson: "Right. Okay, right. Now, let's say... give you two hypotheticals. Let's say you had \$60,000 left to award and each one of those categories, hospital, doctor and home health care, had \$30,000 each in liens. Would it be your intention then that they are to be equal... entitled to equal amounts? In other words, \$20,000 each out of the available \$60,000 award?"
- Levin: "I believe that would be the way it would be handled. We are, again, not intending on changing existing law. We are simply adding additional medical provider to the situation."
- Johnson: "Well, I understand that, but it does change... I'm not against this at all, but I'm just saying I want to understand what you want to do in that regard. Let's say that they had, one had... let's say there's \$50,000 left to award and the doctor had a \$50,000 lien and the home health care provider a \$30,000 lien and the hospital a \$20,000 lien. How would you propose, after the enactment of this Bill, to award that... or to divide that \$50,000 award? Proportionately to the amount of the lien?"

Levin: "I believe so, yes."

- Johnson: "So, it's your intention then to put home health care providers on the same footing as both hospitals and doctors with respect to dividing up the available proceeds after the attorney lien?"
- Levin: "That's correct."
- Johnson: "Thank you, and I... Representative Levin did discuss this with me on a number of occasions, including today, and I support the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate

  Bill 299 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. We are now able to go back to
Senate Bill 295, Representative White's Bill. It appears
on page 15 on your Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 295, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #2 was adopted."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1171. It appears on page 29 on your Calendar. Representative Pangle. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act in relation to reports of child abuse and neglect. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill... or Senate Bill
1388 appears on page 20 on your Calendar. Representative
Woodyard. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1388, a Bill for an Act in relation to the mandatory work fair program. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
LePlore."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leflore."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- LeFlore: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Members of the Committee.

  Amendment #3 have senior citizens and disabled persons...

  disabled people and it... to make sure that the benefits
  they receive towards their SSI, which is in the sum of \$3.

  In some cases it has happened that they end up losing their
  Social Security. This Amendment will keep them on Social
  Security and also enable them to keep their medical
  benefits which is their medical card. And there is no
  fiscal impact on this particular Amendment. This is our
  currently department policies. I would like a favorable
  vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment because this already is a duplication of House Bill 1479, in which the Representative has already sponsored and is in the Senate on Second Reading. This is also the current policy of the Department of Public Aid and the Department has the option of administering the program differently under the federal statutes. This Bill would lock the current policy of the agency and prohibit the state from other options for the program. This is not a good Amendment and it would not justify the purpose and I do recommend it do not pass."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. House Bill 1388, the underlying Bill, deals with work fair and reimbursements by Public Aid to local units of government. The Gentleman's Amendment does not do that. For several reasons, I do oppose this Amendment.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

I think the Amendment is probably technically Number one. Department of incorrect. Public Aid opposes Amendment, as they opposed the... the Gentleman's former What the... the Amendment will do is actually Bill. of the options that Department of Public Aid presently has under the federal guidelines for the through on deductions. And it also has a potentially very dramatic revenue loss or in this case, if the Federal Government should decide not to exempt those deductions, then the State of Illinois and Department of Public Aid would be in a posture of having to pick those up. And so, potentially, it could cost an awful lot of money. An d for all of those reasons, I do oppose the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative White."
White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand
in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. We are talking
about a person who may, through the federal government,
receive one or two, even as much as \$5 above the standard,
and be denied that benefit. So I stand in support of this
Amendment. I ask my colleagues to join with me."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,
Representative LeFlore, to close."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. In response to the first...

to Representative Wojcik, when 1479 left the House of
Representative, it did contain this language. But since it
arrived over in the Senate, Representative Wojcik, that
Bill has been amended and this portion of the Bill was
amended out of 1479. So what I am doing here is inserting
it back in 1388 and I feel that this action should be left
up to the state to decide on what position should be taken
on this particular legislation. So, therefore, I would be
asking... I am asking for a favorable vote and a Roll

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Call. "

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate... Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1398 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1430, it appears on page 20 on your Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1430, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
  the House. This Bill increases the penalties for the
  violation of the Medical Practice Act. And what this
  Amendment does is make this a Class 3 felony for a
  subsequent offense. Move for the adoption of the
  Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1430. And on that question, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "I just didn't hear the Gentleman. What does this do?"

  Cullerton: "This provides that a violation of the Medical

  Practice Act would... the Bill says that the violation of

  the Medical Practice Act would be increased from a Class A

  misdemeanor to a Class 4 felony, and what the Amendment

  says is that subsequent offenses would provide for a Class

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- 3 felony."
- Johnson: "So, you are ameliorating the draconian nature of the Bill as it was first introduced, is that right?"
- Cullerton: "Well, I kind of have a philosophy on these increasing penalties. I think that we should increase them... every year we should increase them by one and that way we would get to come back in the next year and increase it by another one. And see, pretty soon we are going to get up to where everything is a Class X and we won't be able to increase them. So, we don't want to get to a Class X too quickly. We want to do this every year so we can..."
- Johnson: "Would you agree with the Ron Stearney theory that we should just leap frog everything and turn then into Class Z's and then Class X's aren't so serious anymore because that's the way it is, in effect, now anyway, isn't it?"
- Cullerton: "Right, and I just... my thoughts is to kind of slow down the process, let everybody increase a penalty one time by one degree every year, issue a press release and come back again the following year and increase it by another.

  And what Representative Preston tried to do is to go from a Class 4 to a Class 2 without stopping at the..."
- Johnson: "At the mandatory... plateau level."
- Cullerton: "At the mandatory... increase by one. Now, I don't know. I think when we get to all Class K's, then we might want to sit down and seriously consider rewriting the entire Code."
- Johnson: "And when everything is aggravated battery and aggravated assault including spitting on an ant on the sidewalk."
- Cullerton: "As long as they are working for the Department of Public Health at the time, I think that they probably should be."

58th Legislative Day June 20, 1985

Johnson: "Or they are a protected species."

Cullerton: "Right."

Johnson: "Well, I support the Amendment."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, on the Amendment."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, you know, this lawyer talk, Class X, Class 3, Class 4, would the Sponsor of this Amendment tell me exactly what the heck he's doing? I mean, he's going Class A, Class B, Class C. Who the hell knows what it means?"

Cullerton: "Well, what this Bill does is it increased the penalty for violating the Medical Practice Act from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class 4 felony. What the Amendment says is that a second offense, he'll be found guilty of a Class 3 felony, which is one more... one higher than Class 4, even though it's a lower number."

Terzich: "Well, that... Well, what is a Class A misdemeanor?"

Cullerton: "Class A misdemeanor, you can only go to fail for 364

days."

Terzich: "Okay."

Cullerton: "And that's not enough. According to the Sponsor of this Bill, we've got to be able to make them eligible for the state penitentiary from one to three years."

Terzich: "What is a Class 4 felony?"

Cullerton: "One to three years in the state penitentiary."

Terzich: "One to three years. And what does a person have to do to entitle him to a one to three year..."

Cullerton: "He has to, under this Bill, violate the Medical Practice Act."

Terzich: "Which is what? Give me... Give me an example of a violation of the Medical Practice Act that would require someone to go to jail for one to three years."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Cullerton: "I think maybe if you voted against the Medical Society on the malpractice Bill, that would be one possibility."
- Terzich: "No, I'm serious. I mean, I don't understand the

  Medical Practice Act but what type of..."
- Cullerton: "No, I'm sure that deals with, you know, practicing...

  pretending like you are a doctor when you really aren't,

  something like that."
- Terzich: "And right now it's a Class A misdemeanor but... and he wants to change to a Class 4 felony."
- Cullerton: "Right, and what my Amendment says is that the second offense, if you get convicted of violating the Medical Practice Act twice, that it should, you know, there should be a more severe penalty for the second offense. So, what the Amendment says it should be a Class 3 felony, which is one higher than a Class 4."

Terzich: "And what does a Class 3 felony..."

Cullerton: "For a Class 3, you can get two to five in Joliet."

Terzich: "Two to five."

Cullerton: "A guest of the state."

Terzich: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate
Bill 1430 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any
further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, going to the Order of Education... On this same Order of Human Services, two Bills have been added. One is Senate Bill 956. It appears on page five on your Calendar. Representative White. Clerk, read the Bill. It's on page five on the Calendar, Senate Bill 956."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 956, a Bill for an Act to amend
  Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading
  of the Bill. Excuse me. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave. Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on Second."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, offered by Representative White and Deuchler."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative White."
- White: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #2 is an Amendment that was asked for by the
  Illinois Public Aid Department. It's a simple Bill and all
  it says is that 'to the maximum extent under Title 19 of
  the Federal Social Security Act'. It's a technical
  Amendment, one that the Public Aid Department asked for and
  I'm offering that Amendment at this time."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. On that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

McCracken: "Do I read this correctly to be a limitation on the extent of coverage relative to the original Bill?"

White: "Yes."

McCracken: "And what was the extent of coverage under the original Bill? I'm just trying to get it..."

White: "It was upon the determination of pregnancy."

McCracken: "Alright and what... what would it be under the

White: "It was... We think third trimester, which would be the federal law."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

McCracken: "So that you would be eligible for benefits only for one trimester, as opposed to the full term of pregnancy?"
White: "That is the federal law, I believe."

McCracken: "Am I... Am I correct, though? That's the limitation the Amendment creates?"

White: "Yes, yes, yes."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted to Senate Bill 956?'

All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clark O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1183 appears on page 11 on your Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to infant mortality. Second... Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
Amendment. Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave.
Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, offered by Representative Turner."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner."

"Thank you, Madam Chairman and Members of the Turner: Assembly. Amendment #2 is an Amendment that was drafted with the help of Department of Public Health. It basically gives a little more freedom to the Director of the Agency. Ιt deletes some of the specific criteria and procedures that would govern the distribution of the grants for infant mortality reduction and it gives the Department general authority to promulgate these details by rules. Ιt reference... or makes preference for existing

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

recipients permissive and it deletes the provision relating to state participation in the WIC program to require the Department of Public Health to maintain its maximum operation in the event of federal fund reduction. Again, this Amendment was worked out with the Department of Public Health and I ask for your adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. On that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Just for clarification, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for question."

McCracken: "Under the Bill as originally proposed, the state
would have been required to pick up all lost federal funds
for the WIC program or fund at that level, regardless of
the amount of federal participation?"

White: "Yes, it would have. That was the... under the original Bill."

McCracken: "Alright. And this Amendment eliminates the state requirement completely?"

White: "Yes, it does."

McCracken: "Regardless of federal activity."

White: "Yes, it does."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1193 be adopted?'

All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to the Order of Education and taking those Bills that appear on the Special Order that need Amendments or need to be moved to Third. First Bill is Senate Bill 215.

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- It appears on page 21 on your Calendar. Representative Ronan. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act to establish high impact training services programs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Didrickson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."
- Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

  Amendment #1 is an Amendment that was brought to me by the
  Chamber of Commerce and I have spoken to Senator Poshard,
  Representatives Ronan and McNamara and it's my
  understanding that they support the Amendment. It retains
  the HITS provision, but it removes the displaced worker
  provision within this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment #1. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Bill is aimed... one of the aims is to help the dislocated worker. This Amendment would take out the dislocated worker and while the Sponsor isn't here, I know that he's very, very interested in maintaining and keeping the dislocated worker in the Bill. And for that reason, I rise in opposition of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Since the Sponsor is not here, this Bill shall be held on Second Reading for the Sponsor to return, but it has been read a second time. The next Bill is Senate Bill 242. Representative... It appears on page 22 on your Calendar., Representative Hoffman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 242, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed?"

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 350, Representative Satterthwaite. It appears on page 22 on your Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 350, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this is a technical Amendment to put in order Amendment #1 of the Bill that was adopted in Committee and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 350. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 350 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

Didrickson - Koehler..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment #3 extends the granting of initial tenure to

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

teachers from two years to five years. It is supported by what is called the Apple Coalition. The Apple Coalition includes the Civic Federation of Chicago, the Illinois Farm Bureau, the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois, EDRED, Illinois Association of School Administrators, Illinois Association of School Boards and the Illinois Vocational Association."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment #3

  to Senate Bill 350. On the question, the Lady from
  Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. I understand the desire of the Apple Coalition to try to have more flexibility in regard to the length of tenure... the length of service before tenure is granted, but I feel that with the evaluation program that we are suggesting, that, in fact, that will take care of this issue and so I reluctantly rise in opposition to this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ι likewise rise in opposition to the Amendment. It... the two year provisions we have now tenure, I think, are adequate. regarding 1 500 advantage whatsoever of going from two years to three years or two years to five years, whatever the situation should... may become. And I think a two year provision, as far as tenure, is adequate."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Marshal, Representative Koehler." Koehler: "Thank vou. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. rise in support o£ Representative Didrickson's Amendment. I think that it's important to realize that this Amendment would allow... would allow

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

school boards and the public additional opportunities to thoroughly evaluate a teacher's performance. It's important to point out that in many districts, the teacher, two year period has only had a opportunities for evaluation. You take any poll and tha overwhelmingly supports the concept of this Amendment. You take a poll from the Gallup poll that done iust this last year and has been done for sixteen years annually on education to our own legislative polls and you will determine there that the public was overwhelmingly in support of this concept and I urqe adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All

those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In

the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the main

question is put. Representative Didrickson, to close."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just like with the January '85 issue of the 'Phi Delta Kappa' and in there, there is a message from Susan 'Rosenholtz', who is from the University of Illinois, and I quote her. She says, 'Teachers tend to reach their peak effectiveness after about four or five years.' That, indeed, says to me that we need that four or five years before we evaluate those teachers before we grant lifetime job security which is really the public's impression of what tenure is. would also like to remind you that Dick Wagner, from the State Board of Higher Education, has informed me that generally, in the State of Illinois, professors at the University level don't receive tenure untilseven

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

We aren't touching tenure in the State of Illinois. haven't addressed it as an education reform. This is slight modification before we grant tenure. And I daresay that if you walk door to door in your districts when campaign or if you stood up in front of any group speaking on education and reform, they wanted to know about issue of tenure. This is part and parcel of the State Chamber's paper that you all have read with regards to education reform. Five years before we grant that initial tenure is the key component to the Chamber's position on education reform. It should be a key component in our final consideration of the education reform package."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall..."

- Didrickson: "I ask... and so do the Civic Business and Farm

  Bureau and education groups ask for the adoption of this

  Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate
  Bill 350 be adopted?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all
  those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative
  Brunsvold, to explain his vote. One minute."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. At present, we go two years and if the administration feels there is a question about a teacher, they can extend it to three. With that three years, if they can't decide whether a teacher going to be effective or not... or not, five years is not going to make any difference either. In fact. that administrator probably should be replaced also. So, I would ask a 'no' vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record on this Amendment. There are 21 voting 'aye', 94 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Didrickson and Hoffman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. That's interesting Roll Call up there. It shows the power of certain associations. 1 would just like to say that Amendment #4 also is endorsed by that same Apple Coalition and they, indeed, have a membership statewide that they will be reporting back to with regards to our support non-support of these issues. Amendment #4 deals with seniority and how we riff in the State of Illinois. 40 have one of the most restrictive statutes on the books with regards to the 49 other states. Amendment #4 provides that when school districts must release tenured teachers, the order of dismissal will be based upon а teacher's professional and legal qualifications and experience in the grade level or subject matter area rather than upon the teacher's length of service in that school district. is easy to transfer what we are talking about and when you go back home after the end of this Session and stand up in front of those groups to speak about education reform, you may say with an 'aye' wote on this Amendment that you woted for the most qualified teacher to stand blackboard in front of the kids in the classroom. what this Bill does. It doesn't allow that a PE teacher who can walk in because of 16 years of service in a school district can riff the science teacher who has had 13 teaching that subject. That's what this Amendment is about and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #4.

On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She'll yield for a question."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Leverenz: "Now, Representative, I have a high regard for the majority of things you do, but in your opening remarks with regard to Amendment 4, would you please explain who Apple is and that you said that they are going to keep track of the Roll Calls and they are going to run back and report these to the district? Would you explain who is involved with this organization called Apple?"

Didrickson: "Yes, I would be glad to, Representative Leverenz. I did explain. Perhaps I said it too quickly. The..."

Leverenz: "I'll let you say it real slow."

Didrickson: "The Apple Coalition is the State Chamber οf the Civic Federation of Chicago, the Taxpayers' Commerce. Federation of Illinois, the Farm Bureau, EDRED, Illinois Association of School Boards, Illinois Association School Administrators and the Vocational Association in the State of Illinois. With regards to my opening comments, with regards to the previous Roll Call, it is only in reference to the same type of reporting that was handed out and distributed yesterday by another education association with regards to our support non-support of certain education reform issues. wanted to say was that this group who has coalesced around these specific reforms are going to report back to membership in the same manner that I and many of us have been reported on."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Rock Island,
Representative...excuse me."

Leverenz: "Uh, uh, uh. Well, to the Amendment, the Amendment preceding this and to all subsequent Amendments if they come from the same organization. I have been threatened in my district a lot of times. I wish they would just run somebody against me. And the Civic Federation doesn't come out and work precincts for me. The Illinois Farm Bureau

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

doesn't come out and work precincts for me. The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce doesn't come out and work precincts for me. The Taxpayers' Federation, EDRED, the Association οf School Board Administrators, administrators. organization. the school board's organization and the Illinois Vocational Association - are those the ones you are referring to?"

Didrickson: "Correct."

Leverenz: "I have a high regard for all those organizations and from time to time, they come out and explain things to me and I listen to them and I sort it out for what they explain to me. But in your remarks, you seem to say they are going to report back and I react to the threat of the whole thing and I really resent that and the 94 or 96 votes on the board show that I think that the other organizations simply out sells, if you will, or out explains what the issues are and who we listen to and who we rely on for the way we vote rather than to say some organization's got a lot of pull in Springfield. So, to that, I would ask for red votes on this Amendment also."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Rock Island..."

Didrickson: "May I respond to that?"

Speaker Breslin: "No, you may not. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Brunsvold: "Representative, is this the same language that was included in 2195?"

Didrickson: "That's correct."

Brunsvold: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker, or to the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Brunsvold: "That Amendment... That Bill was defeated in this

House chambers by a large number of votes and it simply

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

says that the school district may, on it's own, choose how they want to riff teachers and I would ask for your 'no' vote on this as we did on the last Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn."

Plinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In
the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the main
question is put. Representative Didrickson, to close."

Didrickson: "Yes. thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #4 simply states that we want the most qualified teacher in front of kids in the classroom. In response to the... one of the previous objectors to the reporting back. I, object to the reporting back. It's simply that we have been put in that same position because that has been has done to many of us. It is a fairness issue with regards to that statement. With regards to the coalition who has coalesced around this specific reform, there are many voices out there. There isn't just a single voice representing a single group with regards to education reform. That is the reason for the coalition. broad statewide sponsorship and endorsement of this issue and I really sincerely ask on a very important issue in this year of education reform that you adopt Amendment #4."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 33 voting 'aye', 81 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Didrickson - Davis, amends

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Senate Bill 350."

Didrickson: "Yes. thank you. Madam Speaker. Amendment #5 is sponsored bν myself, Representative McNamara has Representative Davis. It addresses the issue of the minimum teachers salary that we presently have in Our statutes. In fact, Amendment #5 repeals that language. Ιt presently sits at \$10,000 a year for a starting teacher. Presently, the statewide average is \$14,7000. In other words, that \$10,000 minimum says nothing, means nothing and sends a very negative message back to our teachers who we consider professionals that ought to be paid as professionals. If we were to adopt the \$20,000 minimum teachers salary which would have a statement and an impact, we couldnot afford it. We have already figured that out. We have a billion dollars worth of cost associated with such a \$20,000 minimum. Presently, we have sitting in this Bill the \$13,000 minimum. Ιt says nothing, nothing. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment #5. On the question, Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "She'll yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Didrickson, is this the Amendment that

got your picture on the front page of the Tribune today?"

Didrickson: "I have no idea."

Cullerton: "What was the..."

Didrickson: "And I didn't expect it, but it was nice."

Cullerton: "Right. It's a very nice picture though, very nice picture and it was on the front page of the <u>Tribune</u>. I know I'm never going to be there after the Wrigley Field Bill, but in either case, what did your... what did your quote in the <u>Tribune</u> say about this Amendment or about the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

idea of setting a \$13,000 salary?"

Didrickson: "Why don't you remind me of that?"

Cullerton: "What was the word that they... What was the word the Tribune used in..."

Didrickson: "What was the word?"

Cullerton: "I'm... insulting? Could that have been it?"

Didrickson: "I believe that it is insulting to have a minimum teachers starting salary in the State of Illinois at that level."

Cullerton: "And this Amendment would simply say that there shall

be no minimum. It shall be set by the collective

bargaining agreements that are negotiated throughout the

state."

Didrickson: "It should be a decision at the local level, yes."

Cullerton: "Alright. I agree with you. I think it's a fine
Amendment and the only problem would be that if we do pass
it, we may not have another reason to have your picture on
the <u>Tribune</u>."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis." Davis: "Well, thank you. I think we should find a reason to have her picture on the front page of the paper because the Republican Ladies deserve their front picture picture page... page picture. You all got that? Absolutely right. I \* m one of the Sponsors of this Amendment and it is insulting. She is right, and I by George, collective bargaining, now that we have it, ought to set the salaries. Representative Cullerton's absolutely right. And if you come over here, I'm sure the Tribune photographer is around someplace, we'll put both of your pictures on the front page. "

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

opposition this Amendment. I think we agree that a to \$13,000 minimum is lower than we would like to see it but if, in fact, we remove the whole Section that refers to minimum salaries, it would mean that a district could go to \$9.000 or \$10,000 or whatever they pleased and that would be even more insulting, it seems to me, than staying \$13,000 limit. Also, this would remove the current statute that provides for a differential for those teachers that have a masters degree and so we would be removing it not only for the beginning teacher with a bachelors degree, but we would give absolutely no direction that there would have to be a differential for someone with an advanced degree. For those reasons, I would ask that the Members would vote 'no' on this Amendment. A low salary starting level is better than no salary starting level."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Originally, I was Cosponsor of this Amendment and asked my name to be removed because I first of all agreed that the \$13,000 that presently in the Bill is a slap in the face. There is no reason for that minimum salary being there. inadvertently or otherwise, within that, the differential between a master's degree and a bachelor's degree was removed from that Bill as well. I am not in agreement with particular differential being removed which was the difference of pay between the master's and the bachelor's degree so, therefore, I have to oppose the Amendment as it now is."

Speaker Breslin: "We are about ready to vote on this Amendment.

I hope that all Members in the gallery will return to the
House floor so that they can vote on this Amendment.

Representative Didrickson, to close. Representative

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Stange. Representative Stange. We think you ought to leave those ladies alone and come back to the floor. Representative Didrickson, to close on her Amendment. Excuse me. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "While Mr. Stange is up there I just want to tell him that very often persistence pays off."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Actually, that may be pood enough get Representative Stange's picture on the front page of the Tribune. To the Amendment in closing. I'n very serious about this issue. That Coalition is serious. Representative Davis had very fine comments on this Amendment. So did Representative Cullerton. What we want to send back home to our teachers is not a negative but a very positive message that we support them The \$13,000 minimum or the profession. \$10,000 minimum doesn't say it. It doesn't do it. It should be an item that gets negotiated at the local level and I feel very strongly about that and in many of our districts, our teachers are paid more than \$15,000. I wouldn't want to send the message back home that the teachers that making \$17,000... I give, as long as Representative Stange votes the right way. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate
Bill 350 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all
those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted
who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take
the record. On this question there are 43 voting 'aye', 65
voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment
fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Didrickson - Stephens, amends
Senate Bill 350."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman in the Chair.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative

Stephens is going to address this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens, on Amendment #6."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 to House Bill... Senate Bill 350 extends the period for judgement before tenure is granted from two years to three vears. Now. earlier, we had a chance to move it to five years and I got got to tell you, I did not support that. But in answer to the response for reform in Illinois in education. I think that we have to address the tenure issue. Representative Didrickson said earlier, if you campaigned and you really talked to people, they wanted to know what going to do about reform and tenure came up time after time when I knocked on doors and people took the time to tell me how they felt about education. Now, thic called the year of education. We intend to spend three or four hundred million extra dollars on education this year and if we don't seriously address real reform in education. which is not an insult to teachers, but a compliment to teachers, then I don't think that we should go trouble of spending those extra dollars. If we are not going to deliver good education to our children. then are shirking our responsibility. The current situation of two years to grant tenure means that actually you may have as little as fourteen months of on the job service before the administration has to make the decision whether to keep that teacher for virtually the rest of his career ... his or Now, I don't think it's asking too much of this General Assembly to give these administrators one more year, just one more year, actually nine more months, before have to make a judgement that they will have to live

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

with for the rest of that institution's life. So, I move for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 350."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens, moves for the adoption of Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 350. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran."
- Hr. Speaker. Curran: "Thank you, I stand in opposition to Amendment #6, just as I stood in opposition to Amendment #3 which lost by 95 negative votes. Amendment #6 is simply the wrong message to send to our teachers in a year where all we can offer them is a very small increase in salary if Amendment #6 is a step backward in the education reform. We have already decided this issue back in Amendment #3. We gave it 34 or 35 negative votes. Let's see if we can hit the century club with this one. Let's have a hundred negative votes up there. I ask for 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunswold: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Brunswold: "Representative, if you extend to three years, but if there is a question, as in present law, after two years, if the administrator has a question about the teacher then he can extend it to three. Does your Bill indicate it can be extended from three to four years if there is a question?"

Stephens: "I believe that it does, Sir."

Brunsvold: "I would then, as with Amendment 3, echo Mr. Curran..."

Stephens: "I stand corrected, Sir. I stand corrected. It does not."

Brunsvold: "It just is three years."

Stephens: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Brunswold: "I would... of course, that really isn't any different than the law we have now. If there is a question by an administrator about a teacher they can go to three years anyway, so I would oppose this Amendment and ask everyone to join in voting 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for a question."

Leverenz: "Could the Gentleman explain it now? You said something about three to four or what does the Amendment really say?"

Speaker Greiman: "It makes it from two years to three before you have to make the decision to grant tenure."

Leverenz: "Who... Who grants tenure?"

Speaker Greiman: "The administrators. The administration."

Leverenz: "Who is that, the administrator and/or the school board or the school board?"

Stephens: "The superintendent of the school is my opinion."

Leverenz: "Maybe they just make the evaluation and turn it over to the school board to make it... that designation. Now, that we have straightened out the answer to that one, are you aware, Sir, that it's two years now and the school district can extend it to a year? Is it that you want it to..."

Stephens: "For a first time teacher they can, yes."

Leverenz: "Pardon?"

Stephens: "For a first time teacher, they can."

Leverenz: "Is it that you want to take that control away from them and make it three years flat because they cannot exercise their local authority properly?"

Stephens: "Many times, Representative, when... after two years, if there is some doubt about a teacher, rather than extend it three years... the third year, they just simply don't...

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- they simply don't hire. They don't grant the tenure."
- Leverenz: "Well, I used to say that maybe tenure was the big issue in the district to scream about, but I... I have a different feeling about that now. Why is it that they cannot make an evaluation of a teacher in two years or two weeks?"
- Stephens: "Oh, you can make an evaluation in two weeks or two years, but it probably will not be the best evaluation that the teacher deserves."
- Leverenz: "Can you suggest anything they are going to find in another year that they don't know in the first two? Yes or
- Stephens: "Experience is a dear school. The third year, obviously, there is more information. Another year for the teacher to mature and to grow into his job. The third year he is working less on his plan and more on his methods in the classroom."
- Leverenz: "But the fact remains that what you want to make sure, and I think you'll agree with me is, that at the earliest possible time you get a teacher out if they are not good. Would you not agree?"
- Stephens: "Would you restate the question, please?"
- Leverenz: "Would you agree that you want a bad teacher out at the earliest possible time?"
- Stephens: "If you are sure that they are bad, yes, I would think that that's true, but, you know, one of the reasons that we want to go to three years is to make sure that when you have that decision that you are... that it's the best possible decision to be... that's made."
- Leverenz: "To the Amendment. We defeated overwhelmingly and almost, as Representative Curran pointed out, put the earlier Amendment into the century club. The fact remains that the organizations that comprise this Apple

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1995

organization and the organizations that they, in fact. represent, if an employee was bad in the first week or the first two weeks, they'd fire them. They would simply rid of them at the earliest possible time because once you find out they are bad, all they can do is screw uр classroom or the workplace. Whatever the organization might do, they want to get rid of a person as fast I think that the two years is adequate time to possible. find out if a person can or cannot do the job, but the fact remains that the local school board should be allowed to the decision to extend it to that third year or not and we shouldn't tamper with that mechanism and leave the at the local level. I'd solicit your red votes control against this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison moves that the previous question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the previous question will be put. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens to explain... to close. Yes, Ms... excuse me. Ms. Didrickson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Didrickson: "I would like to close on this. It is a hyphenated Sponsor I am with Representative Stephens."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Didrickson, proceed."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Amendment was Senate
Bill 398 in the Senate. It passed out of there with 41
'aye' votes and 9 negative votes. It had bipartisan
support. In fact, Senator Poshard sponsored that Senate
Bill 398, which is Amendment 6 here, along with Senator
Kustra. A previous comment was made that if a bad teacher
or a bad member of the personnel team of an organization

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

wasn't performing, they'd fire them. That's the problem with tenure. It's that you can't just fire somebody. It's a very difficult process and we want to make certain that before we grant that lifetime job security that, indeed, we have the best teacher, the most appropriate teacher being given and granted that tenure. This is a minor change in the tenure law, a modification, and indeed, I would say that the public strongly supports such a measure. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it and the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, for the purpose of a Motion."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would now move to suspend Rule 35(a) to allow the following Senate Bills to appear on a Supplemental House Calendar: Senate Bill 132, 145, 160, 167, 168, 226, 308, 403, 428, 449, 451, 455, 458, 459, 461, 464, 467, 468, 470, 472, 473, 481, 507, 552, 1033, 1410 and 1411. Again, so that they would appear on a House Calendar Supplemental, Second Reading, Pirst Legislative Day so that we can proceed with an orderly Calendar in the House."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, has moved that Rule 35(a) be waived to allow Senate Bills Second Reading, First Legislative Day to appear on a Supplemental Calendar this... on this day for Senate Bills 132, 145, 160, 167, 168, 226, 308, 403, 428, 449, 451, 455, 458, 459, 461, 464, 467, 468, 470, 472, 473, 481, 507, 552, 1033, 1410 and 1411. And on that, is there any discussion?

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, in an effort to, perhaps, sideline any difficulties, I wonder if the Gentleman would mind holding his Motion. I have a phone call that's being made and maybe we can assist on this Motion, if he could hold it.

We promise we'll get back to it before we adjourn, if that's alright with you, Sir."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz, as a courtesy to the Minority Leader."

Daniels: "I'm for flood control in North Lake."

Leverenz: "No, we did that last year."

Speaker Greiman: "We will... Mr. Leverenz, I will recognize you..."

Leverenz: "Couldn't we... Is there a... Well, let me just... I'd

be very happy to do that if we do that as long as we have

enough time to get it out and on people's desks tonight."

Daniels: "What I... what I've asked is that we're scheduled to go until!0:00 tonight. I have a phone call that's been placed. I'll see if I can get an answer."

Leverenz: "I'll hold the Motion."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Mr. Leverenz, I will call you before the evening is out. Trust me. Yes, alright. On the Order of Special Order, Education, appears Senate Bill 215. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act to establish high impact training services programs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Didrickson, amends Senate Bill 1215 (sic - 215) on page one and so forth."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Didrickson. Do you wish to withdraw that,

Ms. Didrickson? Amendment #1 withdrawn. Further

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Special Call - Education, appears Senate Bill 351. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill on page 22."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 351, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
to provide for excellence in education. Second Reading of
the Bill. Amendments #1, 3 and 4 were adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendments 1, 3 and 4?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Kirkland, amends Senate Bill 351."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland, on Amendment #5."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 would legalize what is... what many school districts indicate is already happening in many cases now and that is the allowing of pupils engaged in physical education courses who request to be excused for ongoing participation in school athletic programs to be their physical education courses. from The Amendment would refer only to grades !! and !2 in Beyond the reason that it's happening often now, I would cite simply that a situation of many youngsters being in school more interested or perhaps getting more satisfaction and recognition out of their athletic involvement than they do out of their studies. And when I say athletic involvement, I really have to say sports team competition as opposed to gym class. Those youngsters being kept in school because of that recognition and

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

satisfaction they're receiving are more liable to stay in school if they can combine their sports competition with their studies and have that extra opportunity for study if they need it than they are if they have to do their studying, are made to stay in the gym class, and in some of those cases then, not allowed to stay on the sports team because of the time involved and lose the thing that's... the recognition that's keeping them in school. I ask for support of this Amendment."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane has moved for the adoption of Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 351. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of I think that for kids who had problems in terms Amendment. of 11th and 12th grade who may be behind in certain subject matters that are needed to graduate, that this particular proposal will help those kids and allow them the alternative to continue with those courses that are needed to complete the class work. It also excludes athletes and I think for that reason that it's not a bad Amendment and I ask your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

  Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I support the concept that the Gentleman is putting forth right now. But if you'll look at Amendment #6 which is coming up next, you'll find that the same provision is in there along with a couple other things. So, I think we ought to defeat this Amendment and move the Amendment #6 and adopt #6."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

  Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry,

  Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to say, first

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

off, that I probably have a conflict of interest here because when I come home from these four and five Sessions a week, I go home to a P.E. teacher. She has very definite feelings about how these programs should be. also coached for many years, although I never taught P.E. And my feeling, you know, I've seen good P.E. programs I've seen poor P.E. programs in high schools and secondary schools, and elementary schools. If P.E. is worth and if it's worth having as a program, then it's worth offering to every child in the school, whether they're an elementary school student or a secondary elementary school student. And if you believe that P.E. develops health, that it develops the whole body, that it prepares them for future life, then you're actually cheating kids from not allowing them to take P.B. or requiring them to take P.E. So, if you believe in the concept of physical education for students, I think, in many cases, athletics is a poor substitute for physical education. And it's not a good trade off. I think what we're looking for is an equitable situation. If a P.E. program is a valid program to have in the school system, then it is a valid program for all school students to participate."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White."

White: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

White: "Representative, did you indicate a few moments ago that if an individual is involved with a team sport that he has the opportunity of being exempt from physical education the rest of the year?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, turn on Mr. Kirkland, please."

Kirkland: "No, I didn't indicate that. The language is general in nature indicating that pupils enrolled in grades 11 and 12 would be excused... could be... would be excused by a

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

school board from engaging in physical education courses who request to be excused. The language is general and doesn't indicate that they would be excused for the whole year if they... if they weren't involved in a sport for the whole year... does not indicate that they would be excused for the whole year."

White: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in opposition to this Amendment. Sometime ago physical education used to be taught whereby teacher or the physical education teacher would throw out a ball. This is a new day that we're about, a new game, whereby the physical education teachers teach in the same manner that history teachers, teachers, English teachers teach in their classrooms. honestly believe that with all the illnesses that our society is suffering from today, cardiac problems, obesity, the list is long, that a sound physical education program is important for the maintenance of our young people. Ιf we leave it up to them to opt out on physical education, certainly, they will not participate in the sport or in the program, primarily because they have an easier way out. think that this Body should take the bull by the horns. oppose this Amendment and provide a four year good physical education program for the youngsters in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Weaver."

Weaver: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Kirkland: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative, is it true that for a 11th or 12th grader to opt out of the physical education program, it requires parental consent?"

Kirkland: "Let's see. The language indicates that pupils would be excused who request to be excused. So, that language

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

does not particularly call for parental consent."

Weaver: "Okay. I was under the impression that there was an Amendment exempting 11th and 12th graders from physical education, but it did require parental consent. This is not that Amendment?"

Kirkland: "This is not that Amendment and I don't believe the other Amendment refers to parental consent either. That is the Amendment that would allow more excuses than just being out for a team sport."

Weaver: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Plinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair moves the previous question be put. All those in favor signify by vote... by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the previous question be put. Mr. Kirkland, to close."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just say that, number one, students who are involved in a team sport are getting, in effect, a class in physical education in athletics. Second, I would say that it is unfortunately also a new day and a new game as to dropout statistics, and I think this would give students, as I said before, who are in school, more for the recognition, satisfaction they get from their team sport competition, would give them the inclination to stay in school more than if, perhaps, having to stay in physical education thereby prevented to be involved in team sports would discourage them. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote and I'd ask for a Roll Call, please."

Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. Mulcahey?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the record. I misspoke.

The provisions in Amendment #5 are in Amendment #8, not

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Amendment #6."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. The question is, Shall Amendment #5

be adopted. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take

the record. On this question there are 78 voting... 77

voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And

the Mo... Yes, Ms. Cowlishaw, for what purpose do you seek

recognition?"

Cowlishaw: "Doesn't my button work up there?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, it's on now. It is on now. Did you want to explain your vote? Proceed."

- Cowlishaw: "If I may, please. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment has already been adequately described and I am delighted that Representative Mulcahey explained that the alternative Amendment is #8 which includes the recommendations in respect to physical education courses that were proposed by the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education. I have long stood for all flexibility that we can possibly get in our curriculum at the local level, but I have read the recent Presidential report on the physical condition of the young people of America and from the contents of that report, I can only conclude that that condition is deplorable. I am convinced that you cannot develop to the fullest, even the most brilliant mind, unless it is in a healthy body. I vote 'no'."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to explain his vote. One minute."
- Mautino: "No, thank you. I would like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'. You've already locked the switch, before you announce it, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino votes from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

to Slater. Mr. Slater goes from 'no' 'aye'. Ms. 'no', is that Cowlishaw, you are voting right? Okay. Alright. Mr. Leverenz. Was... Is Ms. Cowlishaw recorded? Mr. Leverenz votes from 'no' to Mr. Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you record me 'aye'?"

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, we are going to dump this Boll Call and we'll take a new Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, dump the Roll Call. Question is... Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Ms. Cowlishaw, to explain your vote, one minute. You explained your vote already."
- Cowlishaw: "I'm sorry, Sir. First you couldn't see my button and now it's still on. Well, maybe we'll get this resolved yet. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brookins, one minute to explain your vote."

  Brookins: "Mr. Speaker, sports and athletics and gym teach other things. They teach discipline, it teach hygiene. The young folks need this. They actually need it. For that reason, I vote 'no' to this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 85 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no', none voting 'present'.

  And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Jane Barnes, amends Senate Bill 351 as amended."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 specifies that library grants must be distributed through the formula contained in Chapter 2 of the Pederal Education and Consolidation Improvement Act of 1981. This Amendment brings this portion of the Bill in

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

line with the proposal contained in the Governor's Illinois
Better Schools Program. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, moves for the adoption of Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 351. And on that, the Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, originally,

  I had legislation with this language in it which was
  deleted in Committee because, as we were able to learn, in
  looking at the issue, it is not clear what the distribution
  of the money under this system would be and it is not clear
  that, in fact, the Sponsor would accomplish what she hopes
  to accomplish. And so I... I think that there will be a
  problem in knowing how we, in fact, make the materials that
  would be provided under this Amendment available in the way
  that the Sponsor wants. And for that reason, I stand in
  opposition to Amendment #6."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I see no problem technical nor otherwise with this Amendment. As a matter of fact, I see it as a very real opportunity for all of us. We get very few opportunities here to provide some assistance for the students throughout this state who happen to attend private schools. Under the provisions of the Federal Chapter 2 to which the Sponsor of Amendment refers in the Amendment, the materials that would be funded through this program provided through the State Board of Education to both public and private schools throughout Illinois. the Amendment should be wholeheartedly endorsed by us all. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 351. I agree with the previous speaker

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- that it provides a very equitable use of grants and would urge your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'

  All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed
  'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, we'll take a Roll Call.

  All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed

  vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish?

  Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

  this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', 3

  voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Further

  Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Didrickson, amends Senate
  Bill..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, on Amendment #7."
- Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #7 is a technical Amendment to correct an error which occurred in the drafting of Amendment #1. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 351. And on that is there any discussion? Being none, the... Mr. Brunsvold, the Gentleman from Rock Island."
- Brunsvold: "Yes, Representative, what does this... What does this Amendment do?"
- Didrickson: "Joel, this is a technical Amendment that was given to me by staff. It's agreed to on both sides of the aisle with regards to that Amendment that we put on with the language from our House Bill to Senate Bill 351."
- Brunswold: "What... What... Can you refresh my memory,

  Representative?"
- Didrickson: "Yes, if you would just have patience."
- Brunsvold: "Yes."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Didrickson."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Didrickson: "Joel, the technical Amendment deleted everything by changing 4 to 3 from the line. It was just an error in line drafting."

Brunsvold: "No substantive Amendment... material?"

Didrickson: "None whatsoever."

Brunsvold: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion

of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #8, Didrickson - Giorgi - Ropp, amends House Bill 351."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the This is the real P.E. waiver Amendment that we should be adopting, that we adopted once before on this House floor and was once adopted in the Senate. And what it does is it provides for a P.E. waiver, not only for student athletes, but also for the academic students who are in their 11th and 12th grade, whereby they are needing some flexibility in their schedule for advanced college preparatory course work and for advanced vocational education courses. would also add that the State of Illinois, according to the Education Commission of the state, we're the only state out 50 that mandates four and a half years of P.E. and health and yet, we mandate one year of science and only two years of math. One has to ask where our priorities are. would ask for its adoption and I would also like to say the student advisory council to the State Board of Education had a forum. They sent out a questionnaire and they found out from the students who are in 11th and 12th grade, they, indeed, support the fact that they would omit the P.E. requirement. This isn't omitting or

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

'demandating'. This is simply offering another option for flexibility. Seventy-five percent of our students said yes, they would omit it. This doesn't omit it. This simply provides the further option."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves for the adoption of Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 351. On that. is there discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite." Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I support the Lady's Motion. This gives only a very minor degree of flexibility in programming, but one that would be very essential in upgrading the quality of education within our high schools. We find that many students cannot take advanced course work. They cannot take the amount of vocational education programs they would like to have or cannot take remedial work that would put them in a position of being employable when they graduate from school. And for the small amount of flexibility that is gained, it is well worth the trade off. Most of the students would probably still take P.E. in both 11th and 12th grade. But for those students who need the flexibility, we should give it to them with this Amendment. I urge your support."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey, the Gentleman from Winnebago."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This

was one of the recommendations that came down as a result

of the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and

Secondary Education in Illinois, a report that's probably

one of the most respected reports in the country as far as

education reform is concerned. And you've got to bear in

mind that this is permissive. Any student who's involved

in athletics, that's why I wanted you to lay off of 6 and

vote for 8, a student who is involved in athletics may be

excused from physical education. Any student who wants to

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

take an advanced course or college preparatory course and into his schedule because of P.E. mandate, cannot fit it may do so, only at 11th and 12th grade. That's it. This is going to affect a very, very small number of kids. The student advisory council on the Illinois State of Education gave some reasons as to why they favored this Amendment. They said that things like they couldn't academics needed for college. One said he couldn't take psychology. One said he had no lunch hour because he had to take physical education - had to take several early bird classes - needed a writing class and couldn't fit it in. Couldn't take desired computer course. Not allowed to take advanced placement chemistry for college credit - forced to drop a foreign language all because of P.E. in 11th and 12±h grade. English, typing, introduction to theater, spanish, trigonometry, computer math, literature, all these courses cannot be taken by kids because of the 11th 12th grade P.E. mandate. I urge you, I beg of you to support this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. stand in support of Amendment #8. As many of you may well know, those young people who are involved in varsity sports spend an awful lot of time, and I commend them for a result of the state mandates that we have that states a number of requirements that students must comply with before they graduate, it makes it very difficult for people who only want to prepare themselves for a vocation after high school. This Amendment very clearly allows those students who are involved in varsity sports to get exempted from P.E., to further their potential vocation in vocational study program. I fully support this and all of you to endorse it too."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Krska."

Krska: "I move the previous question."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Krska, has moved the previous question be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question will be put. Ms. Didrickson, to close. It was so long ago, Ms. Didrickson. I forgot."
- Didrickson: "I would just ask to light up the board with some green 'aye' votes. A good vote, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'."
- Didrickson: "And a Roll Call vote. A Roll Call vote, please"

  Speaker Greiman: "All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

  those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Mr.

  Brunsvold, for what purpose do you seek... to explain your

  vote. One minute."
- Brunswold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've discussed this topic long in Education Committee, and I want to inform you that in Education Committee, this was not the recommendation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee as the vote was taken last week. And I would ask a 'no' vote on this and support the Elementary and Secondary Committee on this position."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. White, one minute to explain your vote."
- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have found that in teaching young kids that they have the tendency when given their way, they probe for weakness. I think that in relaxing our physical education requirements, that we are giving these young people an opportunity to evade something that I think is very important for their growth and development. Physical education is not only the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

development of their physical well being, but there are a lot of other components in that subject as well. So, I would strongly resist this Amendment on behalf of the kids of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McNamara, one minute to explain your vote."
McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As was stated by a previous
speaker that this exempted the sports people from it,
that's already in this Bill right now by virtue of
Amendment \$5. So, therefore, the people that are already
in sports program are already exempted from this particular
situation. So, I would urge a 'no' vote completely on this
issue."

Speaker Greiman: "Nr. Hastert, one minute to explain your vote." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Rouse. I stated once before, if P.E. is worth having, As it's worth having for all students if it's a good It benefits everybody. What we're doing is giving kids a way to find an excuse to get out of an easy way. take extra courses, thev'll take extra courses. I've seen it happen. They'll do it. Ιf we think it's important to have a healthy, strong, physically fit America, have our youth ready to face the riggers and stress of adult life, they should have a P.E. program. think it's essential. I think it's important and I it's a 'no' vote should prevail."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, one minute to explain your vote."

Johnson: "There's a whole series of courses that one takes in school, math and literature and english and so forth. And if you vote 'yes' on this Amendment, you're saying that P.E. isn't even as important as one of those subjects. Like the other speakers, like the other people who have opposed this Bill, to have a healthy America and a healthy

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

Illinois and to have a mentally and academically healthv Illinois for our school children, it's unbelievably important to have a physically fit Illinois physically fit school children in Illinois. I just can't imagine why we wouldn't want to have one portion somebody's education through the 12th grade be to build strong bodies, to build strong minds, to build the strong Illinois."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Panayotovich, one minute to explain your vote."
- Panavotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I taught school for 12 years and not looking the House. even at the P.E. aspect of this and the health let's think about the recreational aspect of the P.E. that's taught for four years. The students look forward to the recreation and the workouts. I mean, we think something that people dread to go to. They look forward to this. It's not just all physical exercise. It's recreational and I think that they do need this for four years, along with the health. And I hope there are more red votes up there."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hoffman, Gentleman from DuPage, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You have to look at what this Bill is doing, this Amendment is doing. It's not eliminating P.E. and it's not saying that people will not take P.E. What it says is that they have... they have an option. No state requires P.E. more than we do in Illinois. And it seems perfectly reasonable to me to give the students some options that they now don't have."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Currie, one minute to explain your vote."
Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. We have

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

We have math courses and they work, history courses. hut we don't require students to take them each and every year for four years of high school. Nothing in this Amendment says that the child who wishes to take physical education during the 11th and 12th grade may not do so. Amendment says that they do not necessarily have to take physical education in 11 and 12, just as under present state statute, they do not necessarily have to take history or mathematics during grades 11 and 12. This Bill sets out the criteria under which the school administration may permit the youngster in only the 11th and 12th grades to opt out of physical education. I think it's Amendment. If we're talking about reform, it's time to get rid of some of the unnecessary mandates in the statute."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Regan, one minute to explain your vote." Regan: "Regan - Regan, doesn't make any difference. I stand for about the same thing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the floor. You know, you're talking about physical fitness, sound mind, sound body. What do the other 49 states do? Put out a bunch of weaklings? We are the last state in the union that mandates four and a half physical education. We're not mandating four years of We're not mandating four years of science. mathematics. world is changing. We're into a scientific view. These children have got to learn more to face a changing world. They can do push-ups in their bedroom. I voted for this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, one minute to explain your vote."

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I hate to say this, but I think the biggest advocates of four years of P.E. in my district are the P.E. teachers. I didn't have

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

four years of P.E. and I may not be very smart, but I've certainly enjoyed good health for the last 50 years after I got out of high school. So, I can tell you that I could have used a little more math, a little less P.E. than I had. We didn't have buses then and I'll tell you what, that helps your body a little bit too, walking to school."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Curran, one minute to explain your vote."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you ought to understand..."

- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Curran. It's been a long day.

  If we all kind of stick together, keep order, we can get

  out of here sometime tonight. Mr. Curran, one minute to

  explain your vote."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking of getting out here sometime tonight, we have discussed this Bill in Committee, this Amendment. It failed in Committee. It should fail here. Let's keep in mind when we're talking about all the tremendous amount of mandating of P.E. that goes on in Illinois, we have just taken a lot of the pressure off with Amendment #5. In effect, this Amendment, in my opinion, 'demandates' P.E. for grades 11 and 12, It is an unwise, unwarranted thing to do. I think we should have more 'no' votes up there. It's the wrong thing to do at the wrong time. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon, Ms. Oblinger, one minute to explain your vote."
- Oblinger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know we've just retrogressed. When I went to school, we had four years of physical education, four years of english, four years of science, four years of math, but we went eight periods a day. If we want to give our kids all the things that they should have, let's increase the day and let's keep physical ed and let's keep all the subject matter. When I keep

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

hearing, well they have to make a choice. The only reason they have to make a choice now is they all own cars and they have to run out early and work after school. Let them go an extra period and they'll get in all these subject matters. I cannot believe that people now don't think we can get all the subjects in because we have to have a short day and we can't do all the things that we should do. We need physical ed. We need english and we need math."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle."

Pangle: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "One minute to explain your vote."

Pangle: "Thank you. I'll take 30 seconds. I think we all realize that throughout the whole world today, industry is hiring professional people to have physical exercise, aerobics and so forth, because it's good for the mind. It's good for the body and it's good for production. So, why shouldn't the students also have the same?"

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Weaver, one minute to explain your vote."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is permissive. It allows school boards and students to make up for the academic schedule — does not allow them to do it. I'm totally in favor of this program, except that this Amendment is missing one critical element and that is the parent. We've allowed the parents to become to detached from the school system and from the education of their children. And for that reason and that reason alone, I'm going to vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, one minute to explain your vote."

Dunn: "Just to observe, Mr. Speaker, I bet the taxpayers wish that we would take an hour off every day for P.E. or maybe a month off or a year off every year for P.E. I bet

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

they'd be happy about that."

- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 52 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, Didrickson Satterthwaite, amends Senate Bill 351."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, or Amendment #9."
- Didrickson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I sincerely thank you for hanging in there. This is the last Amendment be offering tonight in what should have been an education reform package. If we were to put some of Amendments to referendum statewide, they might turn out a little differently. However, I will proceed on Amendment #9. Amendment #9, once again on the House floor, you Indeed, you can't adopt an Amendment like this in the House Education Committee. On the floor, we have done And indeed, the Illinois Commission on the Improvement Schools that went 18 months statewide and indeed, adopted the same language into their final report for people to peruse, and consider and believe that it was going to potentially have the prospect of sticking our education reform package. This is the drivers education option. It doesn't 'demandate'. Ιt provides flexibilities for our school districts to save some dollars, dollars that are important when we start talking about education reform, but are a little short these days when we really talk about meaningful reforms. The drivers Amendment #9 allows for reasonable fees for a personal service course, such as behind the wheel drivers education. It also provides for opting out to certified driving instructors at the option of the local school

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

district, instructors that are certified already by the Secretary of State. I ask for the adoption and a Roll Call vote on Amendment #9."

- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, moves for the adoption of Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 351. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would stand in opposition to this Amendment. In Committee again, this did not come out of the House Elementary and Secondary Committee last week with a positive vote. We are in the process now of... of upgrading, if you will, the teachers of this state with testing, with... or with scrutinization by the principals, increasing that and then in turn, we are going to take these kids and put them in the car with the low bidder. So, I would ask a 'no' vote on this Amendment also and defeat it, as we did the last Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you. This is a very important Amendment to defeat for this particular reason. It is very important that we continue the drivers education under the control of the schools as it presently is. One of the main things that we take a look at is is this will allow the option take it out and to put it into a private schools to agency. In some cases, these agencies are controlled the school. T would rather see that control with the school district itself, with the principal and superintendent and this is a very important situation. I urge the defeat of this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Could we, for a moment, look at what this Amendment

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

is about, that is at what it is directed? This Amendment is not directed at any questions having to do with οf instruction in driver education nor the importance of our students being taught that subject adequately and having a sound background in safety. this Amendment addresses itself to only one subject. Now, let's go back ten years, back to the subject of cost. time when I was serving on a local school board. At that time, the economy was good and in many school districts throughout Illinois, the entire fleet of automobiles needed for the behind the wheel portion of driver education was supplied to local school districts by local car agencies as a courtesy. At the end of a year, those used cars were sold and there was a tax benefit to the car agency. A few years went by and the economy was not so good anymore. Car agencies could no longer afford to do that. have reviewed the records and have found that, to the best of my knowledge, there are presently no school districts in Illinois being supplied with automobiles for use in these no cost to the school district. School districts now have to either lease or rent those automobiles at considerable cost. I have also asked the local school finance officers in all of the school districts that underlie in my State Representative District пe know what the cost per pupil is for driver education, for mathematics, for science and for what I call English and they call language arts. In every one of the high schools in my area, the cost per pupil to teach driver education is at least twice as much as it costs to teach mathematics, science or language arts. The driver schools that we have in the area where I live are all certified by the Secretary of State and the people who teach there licensed by the Secretary of State. In other words, they

58th Legislative Day

June 20. 1985

are qualified to teach this subject. They are as highly qualified as the persons who presently teach the behind the portion of driver education through employment directly by the school district. The school district would still control this program because the contract, of course, would be between the local school district and the education school and that school would be answerable to the school district for the quality of the performance of its teachers. This is a cost issue at a time when our schools funds desperately for math and science and language arts, and one way to free up some of that monev is to this flexibility so that just that portion of driver education that is taught behind the wheel could And even so, contracted out. that option is not even available to the majority of the school districts Illinois because in many areas of this state, there are no private driving schools. Principally, those districts where this option would be possible at all are those in the suburban Chicago area. In short, Mr. Speaker Members of would urge the House, I you. if you understand that it is not a question under any condition that anyone wants to detract from the quality of the driver education programs dependent as that quality is upon safety our highways. No. there is no question of quality It is a question of cost and if you want to help your local school districts to have more money free to use to make the costs per pupil for all subjects somewhat equitable, I urge your support for Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 351."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose Amendment #9.

This Amendment was discussed in Committee at length and it
was agreed to send the Amendment to the House so the full

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

House could discuss the contents of the Committee... of the Amendment. I feel that we should keep drivers ed in our school system; because; if we let it out to private driving school, I feel that our kids is not going to get the adequate training and... in the area of drivers ed. So, I'm asking red votes on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, moves that the previous question be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the previous question be put.

The Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, to close."

Didrickson: "Vote your conscience. I ask for a Roll vote... Roll Call vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed

vote 'no'. Voting is now open. The Gentleman from Cook,

Mr. Shaw, one minute to explain your vote."

Shaw: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. rise in opposition to this Amendment. I think that this... this Amendment is going to create a tremendous cost on the people of this state and I believe that in the best interests of the school system throughout the State Illinois. this Amendment should be defeated. that, the... in the... no one has talked about the cost implementing this program by the Secretary of State or by the various school districts in this state. And above all. the other side of the aisle, they cry about putting money the School Fund, but right here they have introduced an Amendment that is going to cost the School Fund additional monev. And I think that's why this Amendment should be defeated."

58th Legislative Day

Speaker Greiman:

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Curran to... Mr. Curran."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's just remember in this what we are voting for. What we are voting for here apparently is to cut the costs of driver education. don't think anybody is denying that. I think, to cut the of driver education at a time whon driver... automobile fatalities is the number one cause of death of our young people in this country is exactly the wrong thing to do, is an irresponsible thing to do, is the wrong You don't cut. cut when people's lives are being We should see more red votes up there. Thank you."

"Mr. Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."

Ropp: "Yes, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Actually, if you are concerned about saving lives for young people who drive automobiles, maybe you ought to prohibit drinking untilthey are at least adults or a older. This is a good Bill... a good Amendment. provides an option. It does not eliminate drivers education. I wholy support drivers education, think that it ought to be a part of it. But certainly this is option, one that ought to be accepted and left in the hands of the school board to, if they can, in fact, provide a way to provide this service at a cheaper cost, we ought to allow it."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 51 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Special Order of Education, appears Senate Bill 352 on page

15 of the Calendar. Yes, Mr. Shaw, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Shaw: "There was a... it was a physical note filed on this

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Bill... requested, right... a physical note request..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw, the Clerk advises me that you did indeed file a fiscal note and accordingly, the Bill will be returned to the Order of Second Reading and remains on Second Reading untilthe Sponsor provides a fiscal note.

Mr. Clerk, 352."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 352, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Order of Special Call — Education, on page 24 appears Senate Bill 440. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 440, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Floor Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "That was 24, page 24."

Speaker Greiman: "The Order of Senate Bills Special Call - Education, appears Senate Bill 586. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, page 25 of the Calendar."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 586, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Order of Senate Bills,

Education - Special Call, appears Senate Bill 668 at page

26 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 668, a Bill for an Act to amend the

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted previously."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to... oh, or any other...further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions and no further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Order of Senate Bills

  Special Education Call appears Senate Bill 708. Mr. Clerk,

  at page 26, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 708, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments."
- Clerk Leone: "There are none."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Education Special Call appears Senate Bill 723, at page 26

  of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 723... Senate Bill 723, a Bill for an Act in relationship to asbestos abatement."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Amendments? Any..."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 723, a Bill for an Act in relationship to asbestos abatement. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Levin."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, on Amendment
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 723 is the Asbestos Act and implements the recommendations of the Asbestos Advisory Committee. I want to make one thing clear at the outset and that is there are still negotiations and discussions going on and the expectation is that this Bill, while we are going to it get out... try to get it out of here, will be going to a

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Conference Committee. Amendment #1 simply clarifies that the amount of funds being authorized for bond issue for asbestos for the schools is limited to \$200,000,000. This is a technical Amendment suggested by our staff."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 723. And on that, the Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'

  All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed
  'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

  The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Levin, amends..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, on Amendment #2."
- Levin: "Withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Levin, amends Senate Bill 7..."

  Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, on Floor

  Amendment 3."
- Levin: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Amendment #3 defines asbestos worker. expands Illinois Department of Public Health rule making and licensure authority with respect to asbestos workers, to due process language and provides for an insurance pool for contractors and makes technical changes. Department of Insurance has raised some problems with the Amendments. We're... With this Amendment, we are in negotiations with them and as I said, I exptect that the Bill, when we pass it, will go to a Conference Committee to clarify these problems."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, moves for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 723. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Levin, amends Senate Bill..."

  Speaker Greiman: "Mr... Gentleman from... Gentleman from Cook,

  Mr. Levin."
- Levin: "Amendment #4 is the last of the Amendments to this Bill.

  It provides that the Department of Public Health shall, in conjunction with the Capital Development Board issue grants to schools for corrective asbestos action and provides that the Capital Development Board, in conjunction with the schools, shall contract for corrective action."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Cowlishaw... DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'

  All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Special Call Education appears Senate Bill 745, on page

  27 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 745, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Ploor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, McPike, amends Senate Bill 745."

58th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1985
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman... alright. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, to handle the Amendment."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
  of the House, this Amendment #1 deletes the language that
  makes it a perpetual change so it would be a year to year
  change."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 745. And on that, is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook... from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the evening lasts long enough, you may get me in the wrong... right county for a longer period of time. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'

  All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion

  of the Chair, the 'ayes' have. The Amendment #1 is

  adopted. Further Amendment.?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Special Education appears Senate Bill 983, on page 28 of
  the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 893, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code... Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

  Special Call Education, appears Senate Bill 993. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill. Page 18, is that right? Alright.

  On the Order of Special Education... Special Call 
  Education, appears Senate Bill 1056, on page 29. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1056, a Bill for an Act to create a residential services authority for behavioral... behavioral disturbed and severely emotional students. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "No, Floor Amendments, #2, Hoffman, amends Senate
Bill 1056."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman. Ms. Cowlishaw, proceed."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to present this in behalf of Mr. Hoffman? Mr. Speaker. May I have permission to present this in behalf of Mr. Hoffman?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, proceed. Proceed, Ms. Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you. This Amendment is basically identical to Amendment #! which was adopted in Committee and will be tabled. By the way, have we tabled Amendment #!? Well, I think we need to do that first then. I'm sorry. Could we please table Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee?"

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Cowlishaw moves to table Amendment #1 that
was adopted in Committee. And on that, Ms. Cowlishaw. Is
there any discussion? Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr.
Brunsvold, on your Motion to table."

Cowlishaw: "I move the ... Amendment #1, yes."

Brunsvold: "Would she explain what she's tabling?"

Speaker Greiman: "She will yield for a question and she will explain."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee, had some inaccuracies, technical errors and so forth, alright? So that if we table Amendment #1 and then adopt Amendment #2, let me tell you what Amendment #2 does.

There are some additional changes in it which include

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

replacing the requirement that the authority must create the best practice manuals with the requirement that they develop policy statements which seems somehow more clear than best practice manuals. Who is to define what best is? The other language simply seemed preferable. authority the right to review criteria for service eligibility, provision and eligibility, and it charges the authority to develop no later than April 1, 1986, a process for making determinations in disputed cases as to how we are to determine the most appropriate special education placements. So that, Joel, basically, it makes a few language changes such as the one about policy statements rather than something called best practice manuals and also puts a date that is a deadline for us to develop a policy which states precisely how we are to go about achieving the best placement for those young people who have sort of fallen through the cracks in the past."

Brunsvold: "Sounds like a good idea."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?'

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed

'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and

Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Hoffman - Cowlishaw, amends

Senate Bill..."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw, on Amendment #2."

Cowlishaw: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook... from DuPage, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', those

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. It is the intention of the...
Yes, Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose do you seek
recognition?"

Leverenz: "Now?"

Speaker Greiman: "Not now. We'll call. It is the intention of the Chair to do the Consent Calendar, which is on page 36 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 14 and Senate Bill 568 have previously been passed. Accordingly, the question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' All those in favor signify voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action on the Consent Calendar. Alright. to correct the record, 567 was previously passed. a part of the Consent Calendar. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Now?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz, we'll call you. Yes, Mr. Van

Duyne, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry. Could you tell me what the status is of Senate Bill 413? I was under the impression..."

Speaker Greiman: "Senate Bill 443?"

Van Duyne: "413, and I was under the impression that you were going to read it tonight to prepare it for being acted on tomorrow and its finale."

Speaker Greiman: "That is our intention, yes. We are going to read... We are going to... What we are going to do, so the

# 59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Body does understand that, we are going... it is our intention and both sides of the aisle have agreed with this, to read all of the Bills that are on Second Reading that are on the various calls that will have to be heard tomorrow so that they will all have been read on Second Reading."

- Van Duyne: "And then, to clarify it in my mind, we would make the appropriate Motion to have it immediately heard on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Greiman: "They would then go to... They would be on Second Reading, but we will just move them to Third Reading tomorrow. They would all be read a second time today in order to fulfill our constitutional mandate."
- Van Duyne: "Yes, and then would you allow Motions to waive the proper rules so that they could be heard immediately or...?"
- Speaker Greiman: "There may not be any need for that, but in some cases, certainly."

Van Duyne: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

- Ewing: "My light won't work. Thank you. I have an inquiry about the Special Orders. We have, on this side, put in additional requests beyond that which you have on the Calendar. Will we have any indication from the Speaker's Office what has been adopted before we adjourn here tonight and know what is going to be read a second time? It is important to us."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, if they are put on tomorrow, we would be able to handle those on Monday, so we would still have time to do that."
- Ewing: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't really think it's fair that when we put in a request we have some input into this on this side of the aisle that ours be put off tillthe last

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

day. Not everything that's on the Special Order of Business even gets called and as far as I know, I have some Bills on Second Reading that have never been called. And I really think that's... I have never known it to be handled in that way in the years I have been down here. Many times we had many chances to call our Bill on Second Reading."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Livingston... Mr. Ewing..."

Ewing: "Ewing. Ewing, I live in Livingston."

Speaker Greiman: "Ewing, J. R. I understand that whatever is submitted by the Republican Leadership Office is placed on these Special Orders."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

- McCracken: "If they are going to be placed on Special Orders, are they going to be read on Second for the purposes of having them hered tomorrow in the normal course of the Special Orders?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, I suppose they will either be heard tomorrow... read tomorrow on Second Reading and divide some of the workload for Monday. We may not... We will be here Monday. Some will and some won't, I guess. We have a lot of them here, enough to keep us busy all day tomorrow. Plus that, we will be doing some Second Readings tomorrow as well. But they will still be on Monday."
- McCracken: "Yeah, but a lot of them will have been read tomorrow when the Special Order is scheduled for tomorrow, so are you going to be continuing the Special Order?"
- Speaker Greiman: "And we will put the Special Order over untilMonday, Mr. McCracken. Alright."
- McCracken: "And then we are going to hear the Republican Bills
  Monday? Huh? Or Tuesday?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Or if you... I don't make a count... I don't

59th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

- make a count, but..."
- McCracken: "Well, count today because the Special Calendar was overwhelmingly Democratic today."
- Speaker Greiman: "If you will look at... Now, Mr... Mr. McCracken, I explained the way that Bills got on here, number one, and number two..."
- McCracken: "Yes, I understand and..."
- Speaker Greiman: "And number two, it seems ... it seems to me...
  Mr. McCracken..."
- McCracken: "And we made submissions this morning, Sir, and there's never been a Supplemental printed and now you are telling us that the second Cal... or that the Second Readings for Republicans are going to be heard tomorrow and you are going to hear us Monday when the Special Orders are set for tomorrow."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, I'm advised that what we do is not add to Special Orders untilthe next day. It will be on tomorrow. There were many Republican Bills on today. I heard... I called on lots of Republican Sponsors of lots of Bills in the last three hours since I have been standing up here and there were lots of them and now, who else is seeking... Mr. Shaw, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Shaw: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for physical note to House... Senate Bill 351."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw asks for... to remove the... waives the note... fiscal note on Senate Bill 351 and so the... Yes, we are going to move the Bill to Third Reading then. Third Reading. Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Johnson: "Well, I wondered if we were back on 350 or 351. We dealt with mandatory physical education. Where are we at?"

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "The Bill was held for a fiscal note. He waived... He's waiving that and we are returning. That's all."

Johnson: "Oh, I see. I'm sorry. I'm sorry."

Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels seek recognition, the Minority Leader?"

Daniels: "Well, I know... I know there's big conferences going up there, but I know that Mr. 'Hart', the internationally famous lawyer, for those of you that haven't met him, is standing right over there next to Mr. Bullock, and I want you all to know Mr. 'Hart'. He's part of whatever agreements we are going to reach in the chambers here. That's... That's Bill 'Hart'."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Now?"

Speaker Greiman: "Many seek to come forward, but few are choosen.

Unfortunately, your day of glory will have to be another

time. We thank you for being ready and willing and able."

Leverenz: "Not now?"

Speaker Greiman: "Not now. Keep it. Hold it dear to yourself and we will call on you some other day for a Motion. Thank you, Mr. Leverenz. The Gentleman from... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, for purposes of a Motion."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we would continue the Special Orders of Business of Agricultural... Agriculture, Business and Economic Development, Elections, State and Local Government Administration untiltomorrow, Priday, June 21st, at the call of the Chair."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves that
we extend the Special Orders of Calls on the Calendar for
today untiltomorrow at the call of the Chair. Gentleman

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Leave is granted and it will be so ordered. Alright. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is the intention of the Chair to adjourn shortly. There are Bills, however, that are on the Order of Second Reading that must be read today they may be considered tomorrow on the Order of Third Reading. The... both sides of the aisle have that these Bills will be read in Perfunctory Session so that your Bills that are on the Special Orders for tomorrow on Second Reading will be read into the record tonight on Second Reading and will be on Second Reading tomorrow morning when you return at the hour of 9:00. So that leave of the ... Yes, Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the agreement
was that all of the Bills on Second Reading which haven't
been read a second time would be read in Perfunctory."

Speaker Greiman: "No, the Bills that are... that are on Special Order that will be taken tomorrow."

Vinson: "What about those not on Special Order?"

Speaker Greiman: "We'll have moments of Second Readings tomorrow."

Vinson: "We'll what?"

Speaker Greiman: "We'll do Second Readings tomorrow, Mr. Winson."

Vinson: "You'll deal with all those Bills on Second Reading tomorrow?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, I don't know if we'll deal with all
the Bills on Second Reading, but we'll do Second Readings
tomorrow."

Vinson: "Well, why don't we just read all of the Bills in

Perfunct that are on Second Reading, read them a second

time in Perfunct so that the Bills are in a posture..."

Speaker Greiman: "No, that wasn't the understanding, Mr... Mr. Vinson and that would be a bad practice to do, I think,

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

from the management of the floor, for constitutional purposes as well. Yes, Mr. Vinson."

- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I think that failing to do that is tantamount to telling Members that by selecting the Bills that you are going to put on Special Orders that you are going to kill Members' Bills that you have choosen not to put on the Special Orders and I think that that would certainly be bad practice."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, so that... that being the understanding... Mr. Vinson... Mr. Vinson, were you seeking recognition?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just make the observation that while that meeting is occurring, a lot of Members' Bills could be read on Second Reading a second time so that their Bills still have some pulse in them."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Mr. Vinson, are you still seeking recognition?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just make the observation that the real Speaker killed the fair today. Are you trying to kill Bills?"
- Speaker Greiman: "I don't know. It's such a fascinating question, I'll have to think about, okay? We'll get back to you though, Mr. Vinson. Yes, Mr. Leverenz. Good to see you. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Now?"

Speaker Greiman: "Sometime time just passes a guy by. No."

Leverenz: "Please? I move we adjourn..."

Speaker Greiman: "Ah, there's glee over there on the Republican side. So the game plan, Ladies and Gentlemen, will be - Jack, Tony, listen carefully - it's going to be a long night for you - to read all of the Second Reading... Bills that are on Second Reading so that they all will have been read when you come in bright and early tomorrow morning.

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

All of the Bills on Second Reading will have been read indeed today on this Legislative Day hopefully, so... so that they will all be on Second Reading. I suggest that you all be here promptly, and we will begin promptly. On that, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Majority Leader McPike, for the purpose of a Motion. Mr. McPike moves that the House... Mr. Vinson, yes, do you want to have the last word? Proceed, Sir."

- Vinson: "I noticed your concern for Mr. Leone and for Mr. O'Brien, and I wonder if it would be useful to the process for me to make Fred Selcke available tonight."
- Speaker Greiman: "No. But... It's alright. But I wanted... But wait. Excuse me. Before you all leave, I did want to make a point. Often we are not thanked for the work we do, not thanked or recognized for the good things that we do do, we members of the General Assembly. The Pages have asked me to thank you all for the dinner that you bought for them tonight. And so, Pages, we accept your thanks on behalf of the Speaker, the Minority Leader and all the rest of the fellows. Now, Mr. Vinson, is it alright if I go to Mr. McPike? You've done your thing. Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, since it's obvious that the new plan was a

  Republican plan, I have a suggestion that the Clerk that

  read the perfunctory Bills be Tony Leone."
- Speaker Greiman: "Cruel and unusual punishment. Mr. McPike, the Majority Leader, moves that the House does stand adjourned until the hour of 9 o'clock tomorrow, allowing the Clerks perfunctory time to read each Bill that is on Second Reading for a second time this Legislative Day. And on that, the House does stand adjourned until the hour of 9 o'clock tomorrow morning."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bill 238, a

  Bill for an Act to create an Act in relationship to the

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

consignment of work of fine art. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 371, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 447, a Bill for an Act to amend concerning the compensation of individuals for employment related injuries, disabilities and illness. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill... Senate Bill 518, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 533, a Bill for relationship to the administration of Probation Department the delivery of probation services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 560, a Bill for an Act relating to taxes for libraries. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 570, a Bill for an Act to amend the Trustees Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 571, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for regulate the administration of trusts by trust companies. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 518 (sic - 815), a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Energy and Natural Resources Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 830, Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 815, a Bill for an Act creating the Energy and Natural Resources Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 847, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate 875, a Bill for an Act to amend the Grade Pasteurized Milk and Milk Products Act. Second Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act to amend the Home Care Reform Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1189, a Bill for an Act to provide for confidentiality of organ transplants procedure. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1335, a Bill for an

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Building Commission Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 75, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 91. a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to support and maintenance. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 95, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to mortgages. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 112, a Bill for an Act to create the Environmental Toxiological (sic - Toxicology) Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 134, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 173, a Bill for an Act making a certain appropriation. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 179, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate 200, a Bill for an Act to provide for the Assistant Director of Apprenticeship and Training for programs and systems of apprenticeship and other on the job training and establish a State Apprenticeship and Training Council. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 201, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading Bill. Senate Bill 204. a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 205. a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 206, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 203, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to award income tax deductions to businesses which contribute money or resources to community groups. Second Senate Bill 234, a Bill for Reading of the Bill. relating to the admissability of blood tests in evidence.

# 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 235, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 249, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 288, a Bill Act. for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading Bill. Senate Bill 293, a Bill for an Act to amend the Funeral Directors and Embalmers Licensing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 297, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 300, a Bill for an Act relating to qroup accident and health insurance coverage for former spouses of employees. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bi 11 329, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Service Agency Fellowship Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 330, a Bill for an Act in relationship to distribution money collected in the tax amnesty program. Second Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 355, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 356, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for higher education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 357, a Bill for an Act appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and Board of Trustees of State Community College of Reading of the Bill. Louis. Second Senate Bill 358, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board αf Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 359, a Bill for an making appropriations for the ordinary and expenses of certain retirement systems. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 360, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading Senate Bill 361, a Bill for an Act making the Bill.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1385

to the Illinois appropriations State Scholarship Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 362, Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Second Reading of Bill. Senate Bill 363, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of state universities civil service system. the Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 364, a Bill for making ordinary and contingent expenses of Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 372, a Bill for an Act making appropriations... and amend an Act relating to interest in real estate. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 373, a Bill for an Act to amend the Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 401, a Bill for an in relationship to condominium community associations. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 3... 413, a Bill for an Act reapportioning judicial districts and judicial circuits. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 425. for an Act to enlarge corporate limits of the Bill Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 429, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning state occupation and use tax exemptions of farm machinery and equipment. Second Reading Senate Bill 433, a Bill for an Act of the Bill. to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 434, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 435, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 450, a Bill for an Act making appropriations the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Public School Teachers' Pension and Retirement Fund. Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 452, a Bill for an Act

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 453, a Bill for an Act making appropriations t o the Capital Development Board for permanent improvements, minor capital improvements, maintenance. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 456, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Civil Service Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 486. Bill for an Act in relationship to the emergency assistance for low-increase persons. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 506, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the manufacturing machinery and equipment exemption from state occupation and use taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 525, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Holding Company Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 528. for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Second Reading of the Bill. Procedure. Senate Bill 541, a Bill for an Act to make... to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 546, a for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 551, a Bill for an Act to amend the County Jail Good Behavior Allowance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 557, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to Senate Bill 559, a counties. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to leases boards of trustees. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 562, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to

### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

create the Illinois Union Label Act. Second Reading of the 573, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senate Bill Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Second Reading Senate Bill 588, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Education... Educational Labor Relations Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 598, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act and the Bill of Rights for Victims and Witnesses of Violent Crime Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 56... Senate Bill 611, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 615, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Domestic Violence Act. Second Reading of Senate Bill 621, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bill. Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the 623. a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 625, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Civic Center Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 626, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 627, Act to amend an Act creating the Board of Bill for an Higher Education and making an appropriation therefore. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 439 (sic - 639), a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 4... 645, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Victims! Escrow Account ... Second... Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 648, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act Reading of the Bill. to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 660, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 662, a Bill for an Act to amend the Comprehensive Solar Energy

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 670. a Bill for an Act to permit employees to review personnel records. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 688, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 693, a Bill for an amend an Act concerning livestock and dangerous animals. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 694, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 699, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 621 (sic - 721), a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Emergency Employment Development Act. Senate Bill 625 (sic - 725), a Bill Reading of the Bill. for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the truancy the adjudicatory status for truant minors in need of supervisions. Second Reading of the Bill. 626 (sic - 726), a Bill for an Act... 726, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second the Bill. Senate Bill 741, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 643 (sic - 743), a Bill for an Act... Senate Bill 743, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 721, Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Employment Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 723, a Bill for an Act in relationship to asbestos abatement. Delete Senate Bill 723. Senate Bill 725, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to truancy creating the adjudicatory status for truant minors in need of supervision. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 726, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate 741, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal

### 58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Second Reading of the Bill. Code. Senate (sic - Bill) 743. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Bacing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 749, a Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution Second Reading of the Bill. of Marriage Act. Senate 750, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Clinical Laboratory Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 765, a Bill for an Act in relationship to reports of child abuse and neglect. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 780, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 783, a Bill for an Act in relationship to county and multiple county public Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 800. Bill for an Act to protect against the unauthorized use, duplication, distribution of computer software. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 806, a Bill for an Act relating to grain dealers. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 813, a Bill for an Act regulating the amount and manner of wild game taken in the State of Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 814, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 824, a Bill for an Act relating to contractors. material men's liens, known as mechanics' Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 833, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 856, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 564, a Bill for an Act to amend the Boat Bill. Registration and Safety Act. Second Reading of the Continuing in order. Senate Bill 871, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Senate Bill 884, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act and the General Not for Profit Corporation Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 897. a Act to amend the Code of Criminal... Civil for Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 889. a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the Office of Public Defender. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 890, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abortion Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 939, a Bi11 for an Act to amend the Guardianship and Advocacy Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 957, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Second of the Bill. Senate Bill 970, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental 988. Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill a Bill for an Act regulating transfers of property to minors. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1008, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1010, a Bill for Act to amend an Act in relation to school districts and boards of education. Second Reading of the Bill. 1021, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to public utilities. Second Reading o£ the Senate Bill 1064. a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1077, a Bill for an Act to amend the Foreign Banking Office Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 1095, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1104 (sic -1102), a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1102, a Bill Act. for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act.

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1112, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State's Attorneys' Appellate Service Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1119, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1127, a Bill for an Act relating to public institutions of higher education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1133, a Bill for an Act prohibiting local governments from regulating hunting and fishing. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1164, a Bill for an Act relating to fees pesticide registration. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act to amend the Structural Pest Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1217, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. of the Bill. Senate Bill 1218, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Educational Partnership Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1224, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1237, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Forestry Development Act. Second Reading of 1272, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senate Bill School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1289, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1298, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code and create the Care Reimbursement Reform Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1303, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 12... Senate Bill 1352, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate 1368, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the

58th Legislative Day

June 20, 1985

Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1380, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Custody and Visitation Rights Act. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1414, a Bill for an Act to create the Historic Preservation Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1451. a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred in the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles, to wit: House Bill 881, together attached Amendments hereto, and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Representatives. to wit: Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 991, passed the Senate as amended June 20,1985. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.' Senate Bill 358, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors and state colleges and universities. Second Reading of the Bill. Being no further business, the House now stands adjourned till Priday, June 21 at 9:00 a.m."

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 94TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

| SB-0014 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 295 |
|---------|----------------|------|-----|
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 296 |
|         |                |      |     |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 199 |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 202 |
| SB-0075 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0078 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 3   |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 182 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
|         |                |      |     |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 6   |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 11  |
| SB-0092 | MOTION         | PAGE | 12  |
| SB-0092 | OUT OF RECORD  | PAGE | 7   |
| SB-0095 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 4   |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 223 |
|         | THIRD READING  |      |     |
|         |                | PAGE | 2   |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0118 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 8   |
| SB-0119 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 7   |
| SB-0120 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 224 |
| SB-0131 |                | PAGE | 7   |
|         | SECOND READING |      |     |
|         |                | PAGE | 321 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0147 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 229 |
| SB-0156 | SECOND BEADING | PAGE | ខ   |
| SB-0158 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 217 |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 8   |
|         | RECALLED       | PAGE | 183 |
|         | THIRD READING  |      |     |
|         |                | PAGE | 186 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 230 |
| SB-0179 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0190 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 8   |
| SB-0192 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 9   |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND |      |     |
|         |                | PAGE | 395 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0206 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0209 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-0210 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 96  |
|         | RECALLED       | PAGE | 130 |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 131 |
|         |                |      |     |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 9   |
| SB-0212 |                | PAGE | 216 |
| SB-0215 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 335 |
| SB-0215 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 354 |
| SB-0215 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 335 |
| SB-0218 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 12  |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 321 |
|         |                |      |     |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 396 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 396 |
| SB-0237 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 155 |
| SB-0238 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 394 |
| 5B-0242 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 336 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 396 |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 132 |
|         | SECOND READING |      | 12  |
|         |                | PAGE |     |
|         | SECOND READING | PAGE | 319 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 396 |
| SB-0290 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 13  |
| SB-0291 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 231 |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 231 |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 396 |
| J 0273  | 00 000000      | LRGD | 333 |
|         |                |      |     |

12/05/85

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2

|                    | 00.12 20, 130                   |              |                  |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| SB-0295            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 322              |
| SB-0295            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 325              |
| SB-0295            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 322              |
| SB-0297            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
| SB-0299            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 323              |
| SB-0300            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 18               |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 13               |
|                    | THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 236              |
|                    | THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 241              |
|                    | OUT OF RECORD                   | PAGE         | 237              |
|                    | OUT OF RECORD                   | PAGE         | 242              |
| SB-0318<br>SB-0319 | THIRD READING THIRD READING     | PAGE         | 188              |
| SB-0319            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE<br>PAGE | 189              |
| SB-0320            | THIRD READING                   |              | 190              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE<br>PAGE | 191<br>396       |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 14               |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 336              |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 355              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 379              |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 379              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
| SB-0356            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
| SB-0357            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
| SB-0358            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 404              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 396              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0364            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 394              |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
|                    | THIRD READING                   | PAGE<br>PAGE | 397<br>238       |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 15               |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 317              |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 238              |
|                    | THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 239              |
| SB-0401            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0404            | THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 199              |
| SB-0405            | RECALLED                        | PAGE         | 301              |
| SB-0405            | THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 302              |
| SB-0406            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 97               |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0415            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 16               |
| SB-0416            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 305              |
| SB-0416            | THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 307              |
|                    | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 17               |
|                    | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0429            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0431            | SECOND READING<br>THIRD READING | PAGE         | 309              |
| SB-0431<br>SB-0432 | SECOND READING                  | PAGE<br>PAGE | 310<br>18        |
| SB-0432            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 3 <del>3</del> 7 |
| SB-0434            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0435            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 397              |
| SB-0440            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 379              |
| SB-0447            | SECOND READING                  | PAGE         | 20               |
| SB-0447            | HELD ON SECOND                  | PAGE         | 394              |
| SB-0447            | OUT OF RECORD                   | PAGE         | 21               |
| SB-0448            | RECALLED                        | PAGE         | 281              |
|                    |                                 |              |                  |

12/05/85

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 3

| SB-044 | S THIRD READING  | PAGE | 282  |
|--------|------------------|------|------|
| SB-045 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 397  |
| SB-045 |                  | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-045 | 3 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-045 | 6 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-048 |                  | PAGE | 398  |
|        |                  |      |      |
|        | 7 THIRD READING  | PAGE | 154  |
| SB-049 | 9 SECOND READING | PAGE | 21   |
| SB-050 | 6 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-051 |                  | PAGE | 2    |
| SB-051 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 394  |
| SB-052 |                  | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-052 | 5 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-052 | 7 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-052 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 2    |
| SB-052 |                  | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-053 |                  | PAGE | 394  |
| SB-054 | I HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-054 | 6 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-055 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-055 |                  | PAGE | 22   |
| SB-055 | 7 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-055 | B SECOND READING | PAGE | 22   |
| SB-055 |                  | PAGE | 315  |
|        |                  |      |      |
| SB-055 |                  | PAGE | 316  |
| SB-055 |                  | PAGE | 398  |
| SB-056 | O SECOND READING | PAGE | 24   |
| SB-056 | HELD ON SECOND   | PAGE | 394  |
| SB-056 |                  |      |      |
| SB-056 |                  | PAGE | 25   |
|        |                  | PAGE | 20 ₃ |
| SB-056 |                  | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-056 | 4 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401  |
| SB-056 | 7 THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2    |
| SB-056 |                  | PAGE | 139  |
|        |                  |      |      |
|        | B THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2    |
| SB-057 |                  | PAGE | 394  |
| SB-057 | 1 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 394  |
| SB-057 | 3 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
|        | SECOND READING   | PAGE | 379  |
| SB-058 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 333  |
| SB-059 |                  | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-060 | 1 SECOND READING | PAGE | 26   |
| SB-061 | 1 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-061 |                  | PAGE | 243  |
| SB-061 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 243  |
| SB-061 |                  | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-061 | 6 SECOND READING | PAGE | 26   |
| SB-061 | 6 THIRD READING  | PAGE | 157  |
| SB-062 | 1 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-062 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 399  |
|        | 5 SECOND READING | PAGE | 245  |
| SB-062 | 5 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 246  |
| SB-062 | 5 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
|        | 6 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-062 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 399  |
|        | 9 SECOND READING | PAGE | 27   |
|        | 9 SECOND READING | PAGE | 318  |
| SB-063 | HELD ON SECOND   | PAGE | 318  |
|        | HELD ON SECOND   | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-064 |                  |      |      |
|        |                  | PAGE | 247  |
| SB-064 |                  | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-064 | 8 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-065 | 1 HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 399  |
| SB-065 |                  | PAGE | 29   |
|        | O HELD ON SECOND |      |      |
| 27-000 | On SECOND        | PAGE | 400  |
|        |                  |      |      |

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 4

| SB-0662 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
|---------|----------------|------|-----|
| SB-0665 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 27  |
| SB-0668 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 380 |
| SB-0670 | RECALLED       | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0688 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0690 | SECOND READING |      | 29  |
| SB-0693 |                | PAGE |     |
|         | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0694 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0699 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0708 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 380 |
| SB-0714 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
| SB-0721 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0721 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0723 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 380 |
| SB-0725 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0725 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0726 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0726 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0732 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
| SB-0734 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 252 |
| SB-0738 | SECOND READING |      |     |
| SB-0738 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 29  |
| SB-0738 |                | PAGE | 31  |
|         |                | PAGE | 30  |
| SB-0739 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 30  |
| SB-0741 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0741 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0743 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 400 |
| SB-0743 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0745 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 332 |
| SB-0749 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0750 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0755 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 106 |
| SB-0756 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0765 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0780 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0783 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0789 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 262 |
| SB-0792 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 31  |
| SB-0796 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 34  |
| SB-0800 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0803 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
| SB-0804 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
| SB-0806 | HBLD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0813 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0814 | HELD ON SECOND |      |     |
| SB-0815 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
|         |                | PAGE | 394 |
| SB-0818 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 34  |
| SB-0824 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0829 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 35  |
| SB-0829 | MOTION         | PAGE | 49  |
| SB-0830 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 394 |
| SB-0831 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 36  |
| SB-0831 | MOTION         | PAGE | 37  |
| SB-0831 | MOTION         | PAGE | 49  |
| SB-0833 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
|         | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 265 |
| SB-0844 |                | PAGE | 37  |
| SB-0847 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 38  |
| SB-0847 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 394 |
| SB-0847 | OUT OF RECORD  | PAGE | 39  |
| SB-0856 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 401 |
| SB-0861 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 39  |
| SB-0864 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 40  |
| SB-0865 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 110 |
| SB-0865 | MOTION         | PAGE | 111 |
|         |                | 1.35 |     |

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 5

| SB-087           | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 266                |
| SB-087           | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 394                |
| SB-0883          | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 40                 |
| SB-088           | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 383                |
| SB-088           | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
| SB-088           | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
| SB-098           | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
| SB-089           | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
| SB-089           | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 40                 |
| SB-089           | MOTION                            | PAGE         | 216                |
| SB-089           | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 4.2                |
| SB-089           | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 43                 |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 267                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 219                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 49                 |
|                  | HIRD READING                      | PAGE         | 2                  |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 205                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 268                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 280                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 49                 |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 318                |
|                  | RECALLED                          | PAGE         | 332                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 269                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 270                |
|                  | 2 THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 2                  |
|                  | B SECOND READING B HELD ON SECOND | PAGE         | 50                 |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402<br>402         |
| SB-099           |                                   | PAGE         | 162                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE<br>PAGE | 163                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 320                |
| SB-100           |                                   | PAGE         | 394                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
| SB-102           |                                   | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 205                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 50                 |
| SB-1030          | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 275                |
| SB-103           | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 60                 |
| SB-103           | I MOTION                          | PAGE         | 60                 |
| SB-103           | 2 THIRD READING                   | PAGE         | 140                |
| SB-104           | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 63                 |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 320                |
| SB-1056          | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 384                |
| SB-106           |                                   | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 63                 |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 64                 |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 402                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE         | 167                |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 64                 |
|                  | SECOND READING                    | PAGE         | 65                 |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 403                |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 403                |
| SB-112<br>SB-112 |                                   | PAGE         | 293                |
|                  | SECOND READING HELD ON SECOND     | PAGE         | 78                 |
| SB-1129          |                                   | PAGE         | 403                |
|                  | THIRD READING                     | PAGE<br>PAGE | 206<br>2 <b>07</b> |
|                  | HELD ON SECOND                    | PAGE         | 403                |
|                  |                                   | FAGE         | 403                |
|                  |                                   |              |                    |

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 6

| SB-1142 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
|---------|----------------|------|-----|
| SB-1143 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 2   |
| SB-1153 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 80  |
| SB-1159 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 81  |
| SB-1164 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1165 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1166 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 283 |
| SB-1171 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 325 |
| SB-1174 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 81  |
| SB-1180 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 180 |
| SB-1182 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 153 |
| SB-1183 | RECALLED       | PAGE | 333 |
| SB-1184 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 3   |
| SB-1189 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-1210 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 82  |
| SB-1217 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1218 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1224 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1229 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1236 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 311 |
| SB-1237 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1245 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 83  |
| SB-1245 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 112 |
| SB-1245 | OUT OF RECORD  | PAGE | 83  |
| SB-1248 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 83  |
| SB-1249 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 285 |
| SB-1264 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 85  |
| SB-1272 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1285 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 86  |
| SB-1288 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 86  |
| SB-1289 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1294 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 86  |
| SB-1296 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 93  |
| SB-1298 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1303 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 403 |
| SB-1308 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 3   |
| SB-1335 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-1345 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 93  |
| SB-1348 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 111 |
| SB-1352 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 404 |
| SB-1357 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 94  |
| SB-1368 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 404 |
| SB-1370 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 290 |
| SB-1379 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 3   |
| SB-1380 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 404 |
| SB-1399 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 325 |
| SB-1394 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 96  |
| SB-1396 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 95  |
| SB-1398 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 95  |
| SB-1402 | RECALLED       | PAGE | 221 |
| SB-1402 | OUT OF RECORD  | PAGE | 222 |
| SB-1404 | THIRD READING  | PAGE | 222 |
| SB-1412 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 96  |
| SB-1414 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 404 |
| SB-1425 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 395 |
| SB-1430 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 328 |
| SB-1436 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 404 |
| SB-1451 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 404 |
| HR-0333 | ADOPTED        | PAGE | 294 |
| HR-0577 | ADOPTED        | PAGE | 127 |
|         |                |      |     |

... 12/05/85 10:43

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 7

JUNE 20, 1985

### SUBJECT MATTER

| HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN PAGE | 1    |
|--|------|
| PRAYER - BEVEREND JOHN JERVING PAGE          | 1    |
| PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PAGE                    | 1    |
| ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE PAGE                | 1    |
| INTRODUCTION - PAT PAULSON PAGE              | 79   |
| REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN CHAIR PAGE          | 83   |
| REPRESENTATIVE PRESTON IN CHAIR PAGE         | 127  |
| REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAIR PAGE         | 130  |
| REPRESENTATIVE GREINAN IN CHAIR PAGE         | 257  |
| COMMITTEE REPORT PAGE                        | 3 16 |
| REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAIR PAGE         | 318  |
| REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR PAGE         | 348  |
| CONSENT CALENDAR - PASSAGE PAGE              | 386  |
| ADJOURNMENT PAGE                             | 394  |
| PERFUNCTORY SESSION PAGE                     | 394  |
| MESSAGE FROM SENATE PAGE                     | 404  |
| PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNMENT PAGE         | 404  |